

# A Statement

REFUTING CHARGES MADE BY  
A. T. JONES AGAINST *the* SPIRIT of  
PROPHECY *and the* PLAN of ORGAN-  
IZATION of *the* SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTIST DENOMINATION

*Against A. T. Jones.*



*Published by the*

*General Conference Committee*

*Washington, D. C.*

*May, 1906*

## CONTENTS

Introductory .....	3
Some Grave Charges Answered .....	6
Some History Regarding Our Organization .....	12
Reorganization .....	19
Should the General Conference Have a President?..	29
The Charge of Bureaucracy .....	32
The Alleged Campaign Against Dr. Kellogg .....	36
The Testimonies .....	40
The Battle Creek College Debt .....	42
The Berrien Springs Meeting .....	45
Five Thousand Dollars for Nashville .....	47
Personal .....	54
Location of the General Conference of 1903.....	56
Alleged Overdraft of \$300 .....	62
"Suppression" of Matter for Vol. VII .....	75
"I Am Not a Prophet" .....	81
Does It Make Any Difference? .....	85
A Plain Contradiction .....	88
Elder Jones's "Retirement" .....	90
Conclusion .....	92

## INTRODUCTORY

We have no desire for controversy with any one, and least of all with one who has in former days been a fellow-worker in the same cause. It would be much more agreeable to us to stand shoulder to shoulder laboring for the advancement of the truths for which this denomination has stood for more than half a century. But when representations are publicly made which will confuse and mislead our people if permitted to pass unchallenged, we deem it to be our duty, as those who are charged with a responsibility in preserving the integrity of this Advent movement, to make an equally public reply in order that all the people may be able to judge between mere assertions and actual facts, and that minds may not be filled with prejudice and distrust by accepting as reliable, charges of the most damaging nature, simply because made by one who has had a reputation in the past for clearness of perception and correctness of statement.

The publication of this pamphlet is made necessary by the recent appearance of a leaflet of seventy-six pages, with the title, "Some History, Some Experience, and Some Facts," prepared by Elder A. T. Jones, an accredited minister of this denomination, who is the president of Battle Creek College, and instructor in the Bible at the Battle Creek Sanitarium. This leaflet contains "A Statement by Elder A. T. Jones at the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Sanitarium Family, in the Sanitarium Chapel, Battle Creek, Michigan, Sunday, March 4, 1906, 8:00 P. M.," and is being widely circulated. The first eleven pages of this document are devoted to a statement of charges made against the ministers who labored in Battle Creek during and after the week of prayer, of 1905,

reading messages of instruction sent by Sister White to be presented to the people; and against nurses and helpers at the Sanitarium who decided to leave the institution in response to the counsel thus given. The larger portion of the remainder consists of a letter which Elder Jones wrote to Elder A. G. Daniells, the president of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Three general topics are considered in this letter: (1) The denominational organization, in the discussion of which it is stated that there has been such a departure from true principles that at least some of the present leaders in the administration of General Conference affairs are "usurpers of monarchical position and authority," and that at the General Conference of 1903 "a czardom was enthroned which has since gone steadily onward in the same way, and has with perfect consistency built up a thoroughly bureaucratic government, by which it reaches and meddles with, and manipulates, the affairs of all, not only of union and local conferences, but of local churches, and even of individual persons." (2) An alleged "campaign against Dr. Kellogg." (3) "The Testimonies."

In an address delivered in the same place just one month earlier, Elder Jones used as introductory to his remarks this quotation from the Testimonies: "In magnifying the Lord, be sure that you do not condemn and make charges against others." But this instruction seems to have faded from his mind during the month, for in this "statement" are such charges against several prominent brethren in this denomination and against Sister White, that, if they were true, would render all these persons unworthy of the confidence of the people.

We have no disposition to make countercharges, but the logic of events forces us to the conclusion that, in this case at least, Elder Jones has departed from the principle which he announces in this leaflet as the one which he follows in his use of the Testimonies: "When

a Testimony comes concerning another man, I will apply the *principle* to myself, and leave the *Testimony* with that *other man*."

The different divisions of Elder Jones's "statement" will be taken up in their proper order in this pamphlet, and the various assertions, and conclusions will be examined in the light of unimpeachable testimony. It will then be left with the readers to decide whether his positions are tenable, when his arguments have been tested by some other history, some other experience, and some other facts.

## SOME GRAVE CHARGES ANSWERED

Pages 2 to 11 of the leaflet under review are devoted to a consideration of the statement read by Elder Jones to three members of the General Conference Committee who were in Battle Creek. In this statement, though disclaiming any "purpose to attack anybody," he accuses some of his fellow laborers in the Sanitarium with practising a "secret, underhanded, treacherous, and dishonest course," and that "they spend their time just as far as they can, and make opportunity day and night, to create dissatisfaction in others of the family, and even in the patients; to attend secret meetings off the premises, or to hold secret meetings on the premises; to show disrespect to their teachers, to those in responsibility, and in fact to everybody who does not fall in with their own spirit; to despise the Bible, prayer, and meetings, whether for religious service, or for the benefit and improvement of the Sanitarium and its work; to be careless, if not reckless, of the property of the Sanitarium; to betray confidence; in short to do any unchristian thing, and no Christian thing if they can help it."

Referring to the General Conference brethren who had been in Battle Creek laboring earnestly in behalf of the people, he says: "And, sorry as we all are that it is so, it is the plain, sober truth that you brethren have sanctioned it, you have promoted it, you have fired it and kept it alive. You have set the example of holding the secret meetings."

The members of the General Conference Committee who had been laboring in Battle Creek, and against whom these grave charges are preferred, are Elders A. G. Daniells, G. A. Irwin, E. W. Farnsworth, and G. B. Thompson. Those who were present, and to whom Elder Jones read his statement, were Elders A. G. Daniells,

E. W. Farnsworth, and G. B. Thompson. The two latter brethren had been in Battle Creek for some time, and had recently been joined, for a few days, by Elder Daniells.

Concerning the charges here preferred, Elder Jones says the brethren "demurred." They did much more than *demur*. They repudiated his charges entirely, emphatically denying having done any of the things charged, and asked for proof. This he was unable to furnish.

The simple facts are these: Testimonies were sent to members of the General Conference Committee, with instruction that they be read to the Battle Creek church. In harmony with this instruction, some members of the Committee went to Battle Creek, and read these Testimonies, first to the church board, and then in the Tabernacle to the people. Other Testimonies followed, with instruction that they also be read. Great interest was manifested by the church, and by the nurses and helpers at the Sanitarium, in these meetings, as was seen by the large audiences present.

As soon as these brethren began reading the Testimonies in the Tabernacle, many in the congregation came forward and requested the privilege of personal visits. Among these were many nurses and helpers from the Sanitarium. They stated that they were in great perplexity. Because of reports which had been circulated, and things which they had been taught concerning the Testimonies, their confidence in these messages had been terribly shaken. In many cases it was completely destroyed. Scores of these were young people whose parents had sent them to the Sanitarium to receive a training for the work. Among those who were in this perilous condition were nurses, medical students, and the heads of a number of departments.

But the Lord greatly blessed the reading of the Testimonies, and a new hope was kindled in many hearts. Many earnestly desired an explanation of the things which

had been told them by leading men at the Sanitarium, which, if true, practically destroyed the foundation of their faith. In their perplexity they asked that they might have an interview with those who they had reason to believe would be able to give them some light on the reports and rumors concerning the unreliability of the Testimonies. What could be done? Must these perplexed souls be refused help? Would this have been the Christian method to pursue? But the effort made to help these conscientious souls is the basis of the charges referred to above.

So far as possible their requests for interviews were granted. They made their own appointments as to time and place of meeting. There were no star chamber gatherings; everything was as open as the day. Some of the meetings were held in the vestry of the Tabernacle, and some in the office of the Battle Creek Tract Society. Others were held in the homes of those who desired help, either with these persons alone, or with such other persons as *they* saw fit to invite to be present. Not in a single instance, however, did any of the brethren against whom the above charges are made, seek any appointment, request a private interview, or go where they were not invited. And the sole object of each meeting was to render help by answering the questions asked by those who sought these interviews, regarding the reports they had heard concerning the mistakes and contradictions of the Testimonies. A few meetings were held with the medical students in the home of one of the students. In the most gentlemanly, dignified, Christian manner they stated what had been told them concerning the Testimonies, which had filled their minds with doubts, and asked if the things were true. There was no attempt at secrecy; no one was excluded. At one of these meetings two Sanitarium physicians were present, and with the full approval of the speaker, took stenographic notes of what was said.



We had always supposed that it was a proper thing for those in trouble concerning some point of faith to seek help of others, and that it was certainly within the bounds of propriety, as well as a duty, for those appealed to for help, to respond. Nothing more than this was done. No one was urged to leave the Sanitarium. The messages sent were read, and each was left to follow his own personal convictions.

Concerning the charges preferred against some employees of the Sanitarium, that they sought day and night to "create dissatisfaction," to attend and hold "secret meetings," to be disrespectful to teachers and those in responsibility, to despise the Bible and prayer; betray confidence, and "do any unchristian thing, and no Christian thing if they can help it," our observation does not lead us to believe this. Some of those who responded to the reading of the Testimonies, and left the Sanitarium, were heads of important departments in the work of the Sanitarium, and among the most conscientious and devoted persons employed in the institution; and we do not believe that they are in any sense guilty of the shocking charges brought against them. The real seat of the difficulty lies in the fact that, when the Testimonies were read, some believed them, and they simply exercised their religious liberty, not only to believe them themselves, but to endeavor to restore in their fellow-laborers the confidence of which they had been robbed by the subtle, covert teaching to which they had listened.

On several occasions, we understand, they manifested their disapprobation regarding such teaching as was calculated to destroy their confidence, not only in the spirit of prophecy, but in the message itself. It is possible that some may not have shown their disapproval of the efforts made to disparage the message, and the organized work of God in the earth, in the wisest way. But they had the right to disbelieve what was said, and to protest against it in a proper way. This they did in some in-

stances; but this exercise of religious liberty seems to have been misunderstood. Their courage to remonstrate against error, and exercise religious liberty, is what is here called a spirit of "boycott," "disrespect," a "dishonest course," and an "unchristian thing." No stronger evidence is needed of the complete departure of the Sanitarium management from some of the fundamental principles of this message, than the fact that the simple reading of Testimonies from the Spirit of God in the Tabernacle, and the effort to lead persons back into a belief of them, should call forth such grave charges as are here made. Had not the management of the Sanitarium given up their belief in the spirit of prophecy, which is a fundamental part of this message, the effort of nurses and others to restore to their fellow-workers faith in the Testimonies, would not have been termed an effort to "poison the minds of others," and there would have been no occasion for such an effort. But since they had lost faith themselves in the Testimonies, and had committed themselves to a course which the Testimonies utterly condemn, for any one to teach and practise in the institution the instruction received, could only create division.

We very much regret the injustice done some of the helpers in the Sanitarium in consequence of these charges. To be sure, we are told that not the "whole family" is guilty of the charges preferred; but as we are not told who are guilty, the whole Sanitarium family is thereby laid under suspicion.

Furthermore, we deplore seeing such unsubstantiated statements published and sent broadcast. The conduct here described is the most reprehensible possible. After mature deliberation, and after at least some of his brethren had entered a protest against his indictment, Elder Jones charges some of the helpers with being treacherous, dishonorable, insubordinate, despisers of the Bible and of prayer, betrayers of confidence, and then

sums up by saying, "in short, to do any unchristian thing, and no Christian thing if they can help it."

In our opinion these charges are simply shocking in the extreme. "*Do any unchristian thing*"! This statement is so broad that it covers everything that is wicked. It would take in, not only the lesser sins, but sins of the greatest turpitude, as arson, adultery, murder, and such like; in fact any crime in the whole catalogue of villainy could come within the range of this sweeping statement. It is true that he does not say that they have committed these awful deeds, but he does say that their disposition and character are such that they will "*do any unchristian thing*;" while on the other hand he says that, unless forced to do so, they will do "*no Christian thing*." Every desire to perform the duties of a Christian is represented as being utterly abandoned. This, let it be noted, is not intended to be the description of some of the inmates of a penitentiary, but of some of the leading helpers in a professed Christian institution where missionaries are supposed to be trained. If we had read such language in some diatribe written by an infidel against Christians, we would not have been so greatly shocked. But for a Christian minister, the Bible teacher in a college, to thus dip his pen in gall and defame persons who have been receiving spiritual instruction from him, those who are his fellow-workers, brethren of the same faith, and members of the same church, seems incredible! And this, let it be remembered, is after the solemn declaration, that nowhere in this statement will there be "any purpose to attack anybody; nor any attempt to discredit any one, or to put any one in the wrong"!! What stronger charges would any one need to make in order to become an "accuser of the brethren"? We greatly deplore these uncharitable statements, and refuse to believe that any of the Seventh-day Adventist nurses and helpers who responded to the instruction of the Testimonies read, were guilty of any such gross and unchristian conduct.

The charge is further made that "liberal offers of money" were made to some "to leave the Sanitarium." This conveys, intentionally or otherwise, the impression that some were *paid* to leave. This is a false impression. Nobody was *hired* to go. Some felt that they could not conscientiously remain longer connected with an institution which, while professing loyalty to the message, was in reality working against it. They desired, therefore, to connect with some of our denominational institutions. Not having the money to defray their traveling expenses, the matter was fully explained to the Battle Creek church, and a collection was taken for this purpose. They certainly had a right to go elsewhere if they desired, and the church had the right to contribute something to assist them to a place where they would be educated into the truth rather than out of it. And we see no reason why this should be questioned, especially since it is claimed that "the Sanitarium management has not objected to anybody's going away."

---

## SOME HISTORY REGARDING OUR ORGANIZATION

Some of the history given by Elder Jones in the leaflet we are reviewing tells of his official connection with the General Conference Committee from the time of the College View Conference in 1897, until he resigned from the Committee just prior to the 1901 Conference. It also tells of conditions that prevailed, and of his experience in dealing with these conditions. There are others who are very familiar with those times and experiences, and who are also able to give "some history."

The organization adopted by the pioneers of this message for its government and management, we believe to have been in harmony with the mind of God. As the work grew and spread to other countries, it soon became

manifest that the scope of the organization should be enlarged.

Just before the General Conference held at College View, Neb., in 1897, communications came from Sister White that changes should be made. There should be a further division of the field, and a division of responsibilities. Prior to this time, the president of the General Conference was president of the Foreign Mission Board, president of the General Conference Association, president of the International Tract Society, and president of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Assn.; besides being a member of a number of other committees and boards.

Acting in harmony with this advice, the Conference voted "that the presidency of the General Conference Association and the presidency of the Mission Board and the presidency of the General Conference work in North America, be placed upon three different men, instead of upon one man as heretofore."

It also recommended "that the General Conference territory be divided into three divisions; namely, the Australasian Union Conference, the European Union Conference, and the General Conference territory in North America, and that a European Union Conference be organized to hold biennial sessions alternating with the General Conference."

It was further recommended "that a Mission Board of nine members be elected, with headquarters and incorporation in some Atlantic State." The General Conference Committee was increased from nine to thirteen members, being composed of the president of the General Conference, the presidents of Union Conferences, the superintendents of the six General Conference Districts of the United States, the president of the Mission Board, and three other persons; and it was recommended that what was formerly known as General Conference districts in North America, be organized into Union Conferences.

Elder G. A. Irwin was elected president of the General

Conference at that meeting, and in harmony with the statement of the Testimonies that the president of the General Conference should have a voice in selecting those who should be associated with him as counselors, he requested that Elders A. T. Jones and R. A. Underwood be associated with him on the Committee.

The headquarters of the Mission Board were removed from Battle Creek, Mich., to Philadelphia, Pa., and a corporation formed under the laws of the State of New York.

In July, 1898, at a meeting held at Hamburg, Germany, a European Union Conference was organized, with Elder O. A. Olsen as president. In the winter of 1897-98, general meetings were held in the six districts of the United States, but no formal organizations were effected. The carrying out of the recommendations of the General Conference, and consequent division of territory and separation of funds that had been formerly controlled under one management, consumed time and entailed many perplexities that were unforeseen and unprovided for by the Conference when in session.

In February, 1899, the General Conference convened at South Lancaster, Mass., when formal reports made by the officers, of the work of the biennial term, were presented and adopted without dissent. No objection was raised to the form of organization, or to the official acts of the men having the work in charge.

During the session of the General Conference, however, Testimonies were read showing that wrong principles of dealing had permeated the entire cause, and before God could send prosperity these things must be corrected. God's Spirit accompanied the reading of these Testimonies, and a spirit of confession came upon the people, the members of the General Conference Committee taking the lead. These wrong principles had their origin with, and were promulgated by, men who occupied prominent positions in the General Conference prior to the Confer-

ence of 1897, who boldly stated that they did not believe the Testimonies, and took advantage of their official position to diffuse "the malaria of unbelief throughout the ranks nigh and afar off." Their refusal to heed the counsel of the Spirit of God, and their being honored by being retained in their positions and allowed to carry forward the General Conference business according to worldly plans and policies, had more to do with the reform called for in 1897, than did usurpation or abuse of authority upon the part of the president, or other members of the Committee.

The South Lancaster Conference endorsed the policy of the administration, and expressed its confidence in the officers, by re-electing all of them, with possibly one exception. Elder A. T. Jones made a motion in open conference, to have the term of the Conference extended to four years, and supported it with an address of considerable length, pointing out the benefits that, in his judgment, would come to the cause by such a change. From this it appears that he must have been fairly well pleased with both the form of organization and the general policy of administration.

During this Conference, a number of people were sent abroad, means were raised to assist Australia, and other advance moves made. The heavy indebtedness of the General Conference and the failure of the Christiania Publishing House during this term, brought perplexity that consumed much of the time and energy of the officers. A message from Sister White, calling upon ministers and workers to reduce their salaries for a time, and thus take the lead in a spirit of sacrifice which the Lord would be pleased to have all the people make, was proclaimed to every Conference in the United States.

Efforts were also being made to right the wrongs pointed out by the Testimonies. The efforts of the Committee in this direction did not in every instance meet with that hearty co-operation that might be expected. This

caused Elder Jones to lose sight of the dignity of his position to the extent of allowing, as the Testimony says, "an evil spirit to cast drops of gall into his words," and, forgetting the warning given him of God, "he pressed his brethren into hard places." When mildly reproved by the president of the General Conference for his course, and counseled to make the matter right with the brethren by apology, he resigned from the Committee. The indifferent and unsympathetic attitude he manifested from this time on, and the unfriendly and criticizing attitude of the president of the International Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association toward the administration, made the work of the Committee very hard. For these and other reasons, the work of further organizing and perfecting the Union Conferences was not carried forward as it should and otherwise might have been.

At the opening of the General Conference of 1901, held at Battle Creek, Mich., a message was borne by Sister White, that the time had again come when the scope of our organization should be further enlarged and broadened, and other men brought into the work. It spoke also of false principles which were still in operation in the General Conference administration, and in other organizations and institutions.

From a careful reading of this, it is not difficult to understand what is meant by the false principles and the reorganization referred to. The narrow, circumscribed methods which had prevailed were to be broken up; the selfish principles which were controlling the various institutions and lines of work were to be abandoned; a reorganizations was to be effected which would more fully take in the full scope of the work to be accomplished throughout the world; and the spirit of self-sacrifice for the truth's sake that characterized the pioneers in this message was to be revived. The wrong principles which permeated the organization were the evils aimed at, rather than the form of organization itself.



The "change" which was here called for was made. The most of the men bearing responsibilities in the General Conference were relieved, and others were chosen to take their places. The Committee was enlarged to twenty-five members, the principal countries and different branches of work being represented on it.

The Constitution was amended to conform to the increased number of the Committee. Instead of leaving the selection of the officers of the General Conference to the General Conference, the Constitution, as amended, placed the power of selecting the officers in the hands of the General Conference Committee, by providing that the Committee should "organize itself" and choose a chairman in the place of having a president elected by the Conference. According to this arrangement, the chairman could be changed at the will and caprice of the Committee at any time it was in session. This arrangement, instead of being in the line of reorganization, was a step toward disorganization; and two years later it was followed by a proposition that there should be no permanent chairman of the Committee, and that each of the Departments of the Conference should be granted co-ordinate executive authority. The result of such an arrangement could not be otherwise than disastrous. In the end it would destroy all united effort and harmonious action. Confusion and disorganization would be the inevitable result. This was a defective and impracticable arrangement, which was never called for nor endorsed by the Testimonies.

Doing away with a president would no more remedy the evils complained of and reproved, than would the changing of men from place to place, which the following Testimony, dated August 28, 1899, says would not remedy the difficulty: "It is not changing men from the heart of the work to different places that will remedy the difficulties. The education of years has been molding and fashioning the work of false theories. False theories,

human policy, selfishness, pride, self-esteem, and corrupting principles have been brought in to sacred things."

From a perusal of the following quotations taken from a Testimony given in 1899, entitled, "Words of Counsel Regarding the Management of the Work of God," it will be clearly seen that it was not the abolishing of the office of president of the General Conference that was called for, but the choosing of "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness," to stand by his side as counselors, and to assist as burden-bearers:—

"The president of the General Conference has altogether too many burdens for one man to carry. For years this has been presented to me. My husband fell under the heavy drafts made upon him. Elder Butler was counseled by the Lord to share his burdens with men who could counsel with him. They were to be given a portion of the load. But this counsel was unheeded."

"Elder Olsen was advised to share his burdens with men who could help him. The work of the General Conference should never have rested on one man. At first one man could carry it, but as believers multiplied, the man must suffer as well as the work, which needed careful thought and the utmost firmness, in order that right principles might be maintained."

From these quotations, as well as those that follow, any unbiased mind can see that a return, in the Conference of 1903, to the principles of "God's wise arrangement" for the government of his people was not a backward step, or a "usurpation of position, power, and authority," but the sensible thing to do in order to save the cause from sudden changes and erratic movements, which would be made possible at any time by a combination of selfish, ambitious, and designing men.

"The travels of the children of Israel are faithfully described; the deliverance which the Lord wrought for them, their perfect organization and special order, their sin in murmuring against Moses and thus against God.

their transgressions, their rebellions, their punishments, their carcasses strewn in the wilderness because of their unwillingness to submit to God's wise arrangements,—this faithful picture is hung up before us as a warning lest we follow their example of disobedience, and fall like them.”—“*Gospel Workers*,” pages 159, 160.

“Has God changed from a God of order?—No; he is the same in the present dispensation as in the former. Paul says, ‘God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.’ He is as particular now as then. And he designs that we should learn lessons of order and organization from the perfect order instituted in the days of Moses, for the benefit of the children of Israel.”—“*Testimonies for the Church*,” Vol. I, page 647.

---

## REORGANIZATION

More than twenty pages of the leaflet under consideration are devoted to the question of our denominational organization. The main points dealt with are the General Conference Constitution and the doings of the General Conference Committee.

Referring to the 1901 Conference, Elder Jones says that “in that conference the General Conference was started toward the called-for reorganization. All understood that the call was away from a centralized order of things in which ‘one man or two men or three men or four men or a few men’ held the ruling, directing power, to an organization in which ‘all the people’ as individuals should have a part.”

It is now time for our people to get a clear understanding of just what the called-for reorganization was, and just what response has been made to that call. First of all we wish to state very clearly that the call that came to us at the General Conference of 1901 to

*re-organize* was not a call to *dis-organize*. Nor was it a call to abandon the original purpose and general plan of organization adopted by the pioneers of this cause. We accept the assurance that has been given us through the spirit of prophecy, that the Lord led and guided the leaders of this cause who were called to form the original plans of organization for this world-wide movement which we are carrying forward.

Instead of being counseled at the 1901 Conference to abandon the primary purpose and essential features of our original plan of organization, we were instructed to adjust and develop the details of this plan in harmony with the growth and development of our cause. This is a most important consideration at this time. It is one that should be very clearly understood by our people.

Another important question is, What response did the General Conference make to the instruction given? Did it carry out the suggestions? and is it still doing so? or has it repudiated the work of reform and reorganization entered upon at that time? This can easily be determined by a careful study of the instruction given by the spirit of prophecy, and the changes made by the General Conference at the time, and by its history since. The information required on these points can be obtained in the issues of the General Conference *Bulletin* of 1901 and 1903, and the report of the session for 1905.

We here give a brief but complete summary of the counsel given to the General Conference, and the changes made in response thereto. The following are the changes called for:—

1. "What we want now is a reorganization."
2. "We want to begin at the foundation, and to build upon a different principle."
3. "This work must be carried on in a very different manner to what it has been in the past years."
4. "God has not put any kingly power in our ranks to control this or that branch of the work. The work has

been greatly retarded by the efforts to control it in every line."

5. "There are to be more than one or two or three men to consider the whole vast field. The work is great, and there is no one human mind that can plan for the work which needs to be done."

6. "Greater strength must be brought into the managing force of the Conference."

7. "Men who are standing at the head of our various institutions, of the educational interests, and of the conferences in different localities and in different States," are to "stand as representative men, to have a voice in molding and fashioning the plans that shall be carried out."

8. "When we first met in conference, it was thought that the General Conference should extend over the whole world. But this is not God's order. Conferences must be organized in different localities, and it will be for the health of the different conferences to have it thus."

9. "This does not mean that we are to cut ourselves apart from one another, and be as separate atoms. Every conference is to touch every other conference, and be in harmony with every other conference."

10. "New conferences must be formed. It was in the order of God that the Union Conference was organized in Australasia. The Lord God of Israel will link us all together. The organizing of new conferences is not to separate us; it is to bind us together."

Any one who will read the addresses given by Sister White as recorded in the General Conference *Bulletin* of 1901, will see that the quotations given above cover the whole range of suggestions made concerning reorganization. And from a careful study of these quotations any one will readily see what the wrongs were, and the course to be taken to correct them. There were too few men connected with the administrative affairs of the cause. This resulted in centralizing responsibility,

control, and management in a narrower circle than was demanded for the rapid, strong, and efficient development of the work throughout the world. And this naturally forced the few in charge of affairs to assume authority which is called kingly. The remedy pointed out was to bring greater strength—more men of experience and talent—into the management of the work. And this was to be done by organizing more conferences, especially Union Conferences, throughout the world, thus distributing the responsibilities centered in a few at headquarters. The placing of responsibilities and interests in local fields upon those located where the work is to be done lessens the tendency for a few to assume undue authority.

This is the reorganization called for at the 1901 Conference. Now we may ask, Did the General Conference reorganize in harmony with these suggestions? And has it adhered to the changes made? The following facts will answer:—

1. Before that Conference closed, the General Conference Committee was increased from thirteen to twenty-five. It has since been increased to thirty-two. The members now represent the field in all parts of the world, as well as all the leading departments of our work. The chairmen of the Sabbath-school, Educational, Medical, Religious Liberty, Publishing, and Foreign Departments are all members of the General Conference Committee.

2. Before the close of that Conference, steps were taken to organize five Union Conferences in the United States, and one in Europe, increasing the number from two to eight. Seven more have since been added, making the present number fifteen. These conferences are located in the United States, Canada, Europe, South Africa, South America, and Australasia. These new conferences have added about one hundred and forty persons to the administrative staff of this cause.

3. Since the Conference of 1901, thirty or more local conferences; and many local mission boards, have been

organized in all lands. These have added some three hundred and fifty more persons to our managing force.

4. Besides these regular organizations, there are the department committees in charge of the leading phases of the work. The Sabbath-school has ten members; the Educational twenty-two; the Medical twenty-two; the Publishing twenty-one; the Religious Liberty ten; and the Foreign seven; or a total of ninety-two members.

Thus there have been many new conferences, and departments, and local mission boards organized. In this way the managing force has been strengthened by the addition of over 500 of the most experienced and capable persons that could be selected.

5. In addition to this, five colleges have been added to the twelve then operating; twenty-eight academies and intermediate schools have been started in addition to the four then in operation; and thirty-six sanitariums and treatment-room establishments have been opened and added to the nineteen that previously had been established. These institutions have added many more to the administrative staff of this work.

6. In addition to this work of organizing, the natural work of distribution or decentralization has followed. All the institutions formerly held by the General Conference have been transferred to the Union Conferences in which they are located. And all the details of administration that can be pressed back upon union and local conferences and mission boards, are distributed; so that at the present time the General Conference does not own or manage a single institution in all the world.

It is very doubtful whether any delegate at the 1901 Conference had any true conception, at the time, of the marvelous changes that were to follow the simple steps then taken in harmony with the counsel given. These changes have given new life and strength to our organized work in all lands. We have proved that the distribution of administrative responsibilities, and the transfer of the

ownership and management of institutions from the General to union and local conferences, does not mean disorganization. We have proved that all these changes do not "cut ourselves apart from one another," and make us separate, independent atoms. On the contrary, they unify and bind together. This is the testimony borne by scores of men bearing official responsibilities in all parts of our great field.

According to these facts, all of which can be fully confirmed by official documents, the General Conference has been steadily and resolutely working *away* from a "centralized order of things" to an administrative policy that is *as wide as the world*—one that establishes local ownership and control of institutional properties, and full administrative responsibility in all departments of the work.

We wish here to express our appreciation of the counsel given by the spirit of prophecy to reorganize. No mistake was made in that counsel. The great benefits that have come from decentralization, from distributing responsibilities in harmony with the counsel given at the 1901 Conference, have been seen and felt in our cause from the headquarters to the remotest conference and mission station in the great field of our operations. It has been a pleasure to the General Conference Committee and other committees and boards that have taken part in this work, to arrange and adjust the administrative affairs of this cause in harmony with the counsel given. And the transfer of financial responsibilities and many details of the work to others, has brought great relief to the General Conference Committee, and has made it possible to give more attention to general interests.

Now, in the face of all these facts and experiences, Elder Jones claims that the counsel given at the 1901 Conference has not been followed, and that the start made toward the called-for reorganization was long ago abandoned. He declares that since that time "a czardom was enthroned



which has gone steadily onward in the same way, and has, with perfect consistency, built up a thoroughly bureaucratic government by which it reaches and meddles with, and manipulates, the affairs of all, not only of union and local conferences, but of local churches, and even of individual persons," so "that in the whole history of the denomination there has never been such a one-man power, such centralized despotism, so much of papacy as there has been since the Oakland Conference."

This is certainly a terrible indictment. It should be supported by the clearest proofs. But instead of furnishing the proofs, Elder Jones gives us nothing but his own positive assumptions and rash assertions, and these are not in harmony with the facts recorded in our official documents.

He begins his argument regarding what he styles the reversal of the reform that was started at the 1901 Conference, with this statement:—

"Now after all this, it was not long before this whole spirit and principle of General Conference organization and affairs began to be reversed again. This spirit of reaction became so rife and so rank that some time before the General Conference of 1903 at Oakland, Cal., 'two men, or three men, or four men, or a few men, I should say,' being together in Battle Creek or somewhere else, and without any kind of authority, but directly against the plain words of the Constitution, took it absolutely upon themselves to elect *you* president, and Brother Prescott vice-president, of the General Conference. And than that there never was in this universe a clearer piece of usurpation of position, power, and authority."

How does Elder Jones know that this was done? What proof does he give that it was done? The only document that contains evidence on this point is the record of the proceedings of the General Conference Committee meetings. This record shows that immediately following the Conference of 1901, the General Conference Committee

elected Elder Daniells chairman of the Committee for one year, and that a year later they *re-elected* him *chairman* for another year. There is not a single line of evidence in the minutes to show that he was ever elected president of the General Conference until the Oakland Conference, and then he was elected by the Conference itself in session.

This untrue statement is followed by others equally as vital to the case he is endeavoring to establish, but equally as false as to facts. Here are his words:—

“What could be done to preserve the usurpation?— Oh, that was just as easy as the other. A new ‘Constitution’ was framed to fit and to uphold the usurpation. This ‘Constitution’ was carried to the General Conference of 1903 at Oakland, Cal., and in every unconstitutional way was there jammed through. . . . The usurpers of monarchical position and authority came with a ‘Constitution’ that fitted and maintained their usurpation, and succeeded in getting it ‘adopted.’”

Again we ask, Where is the proof? How does he know that the officers of the General Conference or any member of the Committee “framed” a Constitution, and “carried [it] to the General Conference of 1903 at Oakland, Cal.”? We know positively that this was not done by any officer of the Committee, and we are certain that it was not done by any one else. As at former conferences, a Committee on Constitution was appointed by the Conference. This committee proposed certain changes in the existing Constitution, and reported to the Conference.

It is further declared that this Constitution was “jammed through.” The proceedings recorded in the General Conference *Bulletin*, pages 145-173, do not support this statement. It is very doubtful if any Constitution adopted by the General Conference ever received such a full, free, searching criticism in open Conference as this one. Every step of the procedure in its preparation, consideration, and adoption was as absolutely fair

and constitutional as ever attended any Constitution adopted by this denomination.

Another statement in the argument is this:—

“I say in every unconstitutional way, because in every truly constitutional government the Constitution comes in some way from *the people*, not from the monarch. Thus *the people* make and establish a Constitution. The monarch ‘grants’ a Constitution. When the people make a Constitution, the people govern.”

The last sentence in this statement destroys the force of the writer’s entire argument regarding the 1903 Conference. He says: “When the people make a Constitution, the people govern.” Very good. The people made the 1903 Constitution; therefore the people, not the “monarch,” governed. And since the people retain and maintain this Constitution, the people still govern.

It is further argued that “in 1901 the monarchy was swept aside completely, and the Conference itself as such and as a whole made a new Constitution.”

Here it is claimed that the monarchy was set aside completely, and the Conference as such and as a whole made a new Constitution. This, therefore, was the people’s Constitution; for it was made by the people, just as all the former Constitutions were made by the direct action and vote of their representatives, the delegates. Now as that is precisely the way the 1903 Constitution was made, it follows, of course, that in that instance the Conference itself—the people—made a new Constitution. One was as much the people’s as was the other.

Elder Jones asserts that “none of the people had asked for any new Constitution. The General Conference delegation had not asked for it. Not even the Committee on Constitution asked for it.”

Many of the delegates have testified, and will testify again, that they did demand a new Constitution at the Oakland Conference in 1903. Some of them were so much in earnest about it that they served notice on the chairman

of the Committee on Constitution that if the committee did not submit one, a number of the delegates would do so from the floor of the Conference. Furthermore, the majority of the Committee on Constitution called for, framed, and submitted one.

It is further declared that the Constitution "was not, even then, nor was it ever, favored by that committee. It was put through the committee, and reported to the Conference, only by permanently dividing the committee—a minority of the committee opposing it all the time,—and—a thing almost unheard of in Seventh-day Adventist Conference—bringing into the Conference a minority report against it."

This is another statement at variance with the facts. When it was seen that certain brethren on the committee as well as some who were not on it, did not agree with the majority of the committee on this matter, W. C. White and A. G. Daniells, the latter having been invited to attend the deliberations of the committee, requested the majority not to urge the presentation to the Conference of the Constitution they had framed, for fear that, under the tension then existing, the brethren who were bent on opposing it would take such radical positions that they would greatly injure their influence with the delegates. Notwithstanding this, the majority rendered their report.

Elder Jones closes his argument thus:—

"And when at last it was adopted by the final vote, it was by the slim majority of just five."

This statement will no doubt lead many to suppose that only five more votes were cast for the Constitution than against it. But when it is stated that the official records show that *eighty-five* of the one hundred and eight delegates present voted for it, while only *twenty* voted against it, it will be seen that an overwhelming majority of the delegates wanted the new Constitution. How can this be called a "slim majority," or such proceedings "unconstitutional"?

## SHOULD THE GENERAL CONFERENCE HAVE A PRESIDENT?

Elder Jones attempts to sustain his contention that there should be no president of the General Conference by the following quotation from the Testimonies: "It is not wise to choose one man as president of the General Conference."

Taken alone and away from the statements with which it is connected, this statement appears to convey the idea that there should be no General Conference presidency. But when read with what precedes and follows it, a very different idea will be gained.

This statement is made in a Testimony written in Australia, August, 1896, and addressed to "Conference Presidents and Counselors." The Testimony opens as follows:—

"God gave to Moses special direction for the management of his work. He directed Moses to associate men with him as counselors, that his burdens might be lightened."

Then there is quoted the advice of Jethro to Moses as recorded in Exodus 18:19-23. Following this, it is said:—

"This counsel is for us. It should be heeded by our responsible men. The president of our General Conference has been left to gather to himself burdens which God has not laid upon him, and the things that he has tried to do could not be done wisely and well."

Under the subhead "Study God's Methods," the following counsel is given:—

"As a people we should study God's plans for conducting his work. Wherever he has given directions in regard to any point, we should carefully consider how to regard his expressed will. This work should have special atten-

tion. It is not wise to choose one man as president of the General Conference. The work of the General Conference has extended, and some things have been made unnecessarily complicated. A want of discernment has been shown. There should be a division of the field, or some other plan should be devised to change the present order of things."

"The president of the General Conference should have the privilege of deciding who shall stand by his side as counselors."

"Counselors of the character that God chose for Moses are needed by the president of the General Conference. It was his privilege at least to express his preference as to the men who should be his counselors."

The facts set forth in these statements are these: Moses was carrying too many cares and burdens; through Jethro the Lord gave him special direction for the management of his work; he was instructed to associate good, able men with himself as counselors. This, we are told, is counsel for us; for the president of the General Conference was carrying too many burdens.

At this point occurs the statement that it is not wise to choose one man as president of the General Conference, which is followed by the statements that the work of the General Conference has extended, has become unnecessarily complicated, and that there should be a division of the field, or some other plan devised to change the situation.

Now is this counsel intended to convey the idea that the General Conference should have no president, or that one man should not stand alone in bearing the many great burdens of the General Conference? The counsel that follows this statement makes the question plain. It is this: "The president of the General Conference should have the privilege of deciding who shall stand by his side as counselors." "Counselors of the character that God chose for Moses are needed by the president of the

General Conference. It was his privilege at least to express his preference as to the men who should be his counselors."

Taking all these statements together, the counsel is harmonious and consistent all the way through. And it makes the case of Moses a pertinent example.

The fact that following the statement which Elder Jones quotes to prove that there should be no president of the General Conference, instruction is given as to how the "president of the General Conference" is to secure his counselors, and what should be the character of the counselors of the "president of the General Conference," shows very clearly that the writer did not understand that there should be no president of the General Conference.

Taken all together, this Testimony, instead of proving that there should be no president of the General Conference, proves that there *should be* a president of the General Conference, who should have associated with him a committee for counsel. And yet, in the face of this plain statement of the Testimony itself, Elder Jones detaches a single sentence, and uses it to prove just the opposite of that which the instruction really conveys.

The Testimony from which the extract under consideration is made was written ten years ago, and during all this time communications have been coming to the president of the General Conference to guide him in the discharge of his duties. And of one who has filled the position of president during a portion of this time, a Testimony expressly says that he is "the right man in the right place." No such statement as this would have been made if the theory were true that there should be no such "place" to be filled by anybody.

## THE CHARGE OF BUREAUCRACY

Elder Jones makes the sweeping charge that "the present order of General Conference affairs is a thoroughly bureaucratic government;" that "that is what in practise every section is, whatever it may be called." The title "Religious Liberty Bureau," he declares is "expressive of the whole." He pictures the whole organization as arbitrary, czar-like, papal in principle and practise, and opposed to Christianity and individual freedom. Because the General Conference "has one man at the head and center of its organization," he conveys the idea that this denomination has "a visible head," and declares that "in this one thing the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is more like the Catholic Church than is any other Protestant church in the world."

This, if true, is a very serious and sad condition for the denomination to be in. If it rightly represents matters, no lover of liberty would long remain with the denomination; he would seek affiliation with some church less "like the Catholic Church." Moreover, if true, the denomination has been "like the Catholic Church" for many years; for with the exception of 1901-02, there has been a president of the General Conference ever since the Conference was first organized in 1863.

But is it true? Is an organization divided into departments, or bureaus, necessarily bureaucratic in the bad sense of that term? A bureaucratic government may be bad; but this does not prove that every government or organization with a bureau or with bureaus is bad. Civil governments themselves have generally been bad. Shall we therefore condemn all civil government?

To our minds this is simply absurd and extravagant,—an example of strained logic and special pleading. A false argument is made by making a play upon words.



An unreasonable and unwarranted premise is laid down, and from it an extreme and extravagant conclusion is drawn.

If it is impossible for a bureau to exist in a republican form of government, how is it that the government of the United States continues to be a republic with its Weather Bureau, its Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Bureau of Statistics, and a score or more of other bureaus?

A few years ago, the *Catholic World*, of New York, declared Seventh-day Adventists to be the only "remnant of true Protestantism in the world." And the *Catholic Mirror*, in its articles on "The Christian Sabbath," published in 1893, singled them out as the only sect of Protestants who adhere to the Bible and the Bible only as their teacher and guide. Now is it not a little strange that, while Catholics regard Seventh-day Adventists as the most unlike the Catholic Church of all the Protestant churches in the world, Elder Jones has so changed as to openly declare that, in that which constitutes the very essence of the Papacy, "the Seventh-day Adventist denomination is more like the Catholic Church than is any other Protestant church in the world"?

So far as we are aware, Elder Jones has never refused to occupy positions of responsibility in the denomination. Without protest, he has repeatedly allowed himself to be elected "president" of a State Conference, of the International Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association, and of other organizations in our ranks. Against these he has raised no protest or note of warning. Why, then, this cry of "popery" because there is a president of the General Conference?

In defending themselves in a wrong course, men naturally accuse others of the very things of which they themselves are guilty. This principle is stated in Rom. 2: 1: "Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same thing."

Elder Jones has identified himself with a movement, and has become the champion of a movement, that for years has sought either to dominate, or, if it could not dominate, to overthrow, all properly constituted order, organization, and united effort in this denomination, and which, in not a little of its doings, has truly been "arbitrary," "papal," and "bureaucratic." And now that the Testimonies have rebuked that wrong, ambitious thing, and the officers of the General Conference have stood by the Testimonies in seeking to correct that wrong, Elder Jones styles the whole General Conference organization papal, arbitrary, and bureaucratic.

But we do not think that those who know the truth will be deceived by any such charges, or that they will, on account of such arguments, become alarmed, and think that their liberties are going to be taken away from them because order, organization, and discipline are maintained in the denomination. When in the local sanitarium work there arises what appears to the management to be a spirit of insubordination and disorder, Elder Jones very quickly recognizes the need and the propriety of order, system, and discipline, and complains very bitterly if any there "show disrespect to their teachers" and "to those in responsibility." But if order, system, and discipline are needed in the local work, or in one branch of the work, how can they be less so in the general work?

We do not think that this denomination will decide at this late day to throw all order, organization, and discipline overboard. Now, as in all ages past, the loyal and true will stand for order and organization. The Testimonies have spoken too plainly upon this subject to be misunderstood. They say:—

"There is order in heaven, and God is pleased with the efforts of his people in trying to move with system and order in his work on earth."

"There are many restless spirits who will not submit to discipline, system, and order. They think that their

liberties would be abridged were they to lay aside their own judgment and submit to the judgment of those of experience."

"Satan well knows that success can only attend order and harmonious action. He well knows that everything connected with heaven is in perfect order, that subjection and perfect discipline mark the movements of the angelic host. It is his studied effort to lead professed Christians just as far from heaven's arrangement as he can; therefore he deceives even the professed people of God, and makes them believe that order and discipline are enemies to spirituality; that the only safety for them is to let each pursue his own course, and to remain especially distinct from bodies of Christians who are united, and are laboring to establish discipline and harmony of action. All the efforts to establish order are *considered dangerous, a restriction of rightful liberty, and hence are feared as popery.*"—*Testimonies for the Church,* Vol. I, pages 191, 413, 649, 650.

"O how Satan would rejoice to get in among this people, and disorganize the work at a time when thorough organization is essential, and will be the greatest power to keep out spurious uprisings, and to refute claims not endorsed by the word of God. We want to hold the lines evenly, that there shall be no breaking down of the system of regulation and order. In this way license shall not be given to disorderly elements to control the work at this time. We are living in a time when order, system, and unity of action are most essential. And the truth must bind us together like strong cords in order that no distracted efforts may be witnessed among the workers. If disorderly manifestations appear, we must have clear discernment to distinguish the spurious from the genuine."—*Special Testimonies,* No. 3, pages 60, 61.

## THE ALLEGED CAMPAIGN AGAINST DR. KELLOGG

Pages 24-29 of this leaflet are devoted to what Elder Jones terms "the campaign against Dr. Kellogg." He says: "I told you in the very beginning of it that I would never take any part in it."

We might dispose of this charge by saying, there is no such campaign. It has been repeatedly asserted that the General Conference was waging a warfare upon Dr. Kellogg. The real issue has thus been brushed aside, and continued representations have been made that the controversy which has been on for some time, is merely a wrangle between the leaders of the medical work and the officers of the General Conference.

But this is a false issue. There is no warfare being waged against Dr. Kellogg, or any other man, as such; and we have never asked Elder Jones or any one else to unite with us in any such work. We have neither the time nor the disposition to step aside from the sacred work committed to us, and engage in a contest with men. Let it be understood by all for all time that this is not our mission.

That the denomination has been passing through a sad and most trying experience during the past four years, we freely admit. But the controversy has been one concerning vital and fundamental principles,—a controversy between truth and error. The fundamental principles of our message have been assailed. Besides this, a policy of administration has been contending for the mastery which is destructive of all organization, and, if allowed to secure the supremacy, would bring anarchy and ruin. It is against these things, and these only, that we have been contending. And against these evil things we expect to contend to the end. Men are involved in the contention only as they are the champions of opposing principles. If

the men who are now leaders in the strife which is in our midst should step aside, and others take their places, and the apostasy and wicked spirit of domination should continue to assert themselves, the warfare would still continue. Once more let us say, that it is against *wrong principles*, and *not men*, that we are contending.

That man is a hireling who, when he sees the flock in danger, flees and leaves them to be devoured. That watchman who, while standing on the walls of Zion, fails to blow the trumpet, and warn the city when the enemy is approaching, is unfaithful; and the blood of those who perish in the overthrow will be required at his hands.

In a recent Testimony the watchmen have been instructed as follows:—

“Few can see the meaning of the *present apostasy*. But the Lord has lifted the curtain, and has shown me its meaning, and the result that it will have if allowed to continue. *We must now lift our voices in warning.*”

This is a complete explanation of the trouble and contention which have been taxing the energies of this denomination for several years. There is an *apostasy* developing. It is against this evil that we are contending, and not against some man or combination of men. We are here bidden to lift our voices in warning. This we have done the best we have known how.

This apostasy is further described as follows:—

“I was shown a platform, braced by solid timbers,—the truths of the Word of God. Some one high in responsibility in the medical work was directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers supporting this platform. Then I heard a voice saying, ‘Where are the watchmen that ought to be standing on the walls of Zion? Are they asleep? How can they be silent? This foundation was built by the Master Worker, and will stand storm and tempest. Will they permit this man to present doctrines that deny the past experiences of the people of God? The time has come to take decided action!’”

The very work here described has for some time been going on in our midst. The leader is described as a man "high in responsibility in the medical work." He is represented as directing a movement to pull down and destroy the platform of this message. And he is not alone in this destructive work; for he is "directing this man and that man to loosen the timbers." In alarm the question is asked, "Where are the watchmen?" "Are they asleep?" Our whole effort has been and still is to maintain the fundamental truths which have made us a people. In as Christian a manner as we knew how, we have endeavored to hinder this perilous and destructive work. How could we remain silent when we are told that the time had come to take "decided action"?

But when men endeavor to lift up a warning voice as God has commanded them to do, sympathizers with the apostasy call it persecution, and a "campaign against Dr. Kellogg." But must men be denounced because they stand in defense of the "faith which was once delivered unto the saints"? Must we allow the seeds of doubt and unbelief to be sown broadcast, and make no effort to uproot their baneful influence, because some certain man or men happen to be champions of error? Must some Goliath be permitted to defy the armies of the living God, and all Israel remain in their tents, lest a cry be raised that "warfare" is being waged against somebody? The cry of apostasy has ever been, "Ye have killed the people of the Lord." It claims the right to carry on its destructive work without opposition. With it, opposition is persecution.

But the church of God has been set for the defense of the truth, and it can not sit idly by while men wreck the hopes of sincere, confiding hearts for time and for eternity. Elder Jones may boast, if he wishes, that he will "never take any part" in this campaign against error; and so far as we know he has not. Instead, however, he has, to all appearances, allied himself with this

apostasy, has become a part of it, and now stands forth as its most prominent champion. Of this, the leaflet under review is indisputable evidence. Its whole tendency is to destroy confidence in the spirit of prophecy, and to erect a standard around which all the disorganized atoms within the denomination can rally. Which will be the better in the day of God, to have been found a silent watchman on the walls of Zion, while the enemy sought to capture the city, or to have lifted the trumpet and sounded a warning against the deceptive workings of error, the Word of God clearly reveals.

There are other causes for the trouble which has disturbed us as a denomination, and which has given rise to the false cry of a "campaign against Dr. Kellogg," than the subtle, dangerous philosophy which has been seeking to usurp the place of the fundamental truths of this message. The false sentiments of theology against which we are forced to contend, constitute but a part of the difficulty. Plans of organization and administration have been urged upon the denomination which would make the medical missionary work the body instead of the arm, and give to a central board of management, and to a single individual, a controlling, dominating power which would utterly pervert God's plan of organization.

Instead of the medical missionary arm being willing to be directed by the body, the arm has been endeavoring to direct the body. The following warning against this abnormal condition makes this matter clear: "Medical missionary work is in no case to be divorced from the gospel ministry. The Lord has specified that the two shall be as closely connected as the arm is with the body. Weaken this union, neither part of the work is complete. . . . But God did not design that the medical missionary work should eclipse the work of the third angel's message. *The arm is not to become the body.*"

"The leaders in our medical work at Battle Creek have endeavored to bind our medical institutions fast, in

accordance with their plans. Notwithstanding the many warnings given them that this should not be done, they have desired to bind up these institutions in some way so that all our medical work shall be under their control."

We deem it unnecessary to take more space in giving quotations from the Testimonies regarding this question. For years this arbitrary, dominating spirit has been seeking to control and turn aside the work of this denomination. The ministry has been belittled, and the third angel's message itself has largely been ignored, and its truths "blanketed." The effort of the body to resist the domination of the arm, and keep the truths of this cause to the front, is one of the chief causes of our present difficulties. We well know the real animus which underlies this warfare which is being made upon our denominational organization. It is not a new thing. Disorganization has had its champions in our midst from the beginning of our history. The cry of "popery" has been raised before.

---

## THE TESTIMONIES

We come now to the most important as well as the most serious part of the document under review. What follows is a review and a refutation of what are probably the most subtle and dangerous statements ever put before our people regarding the Testimonies. Whatever may have been the real purpose of the writer, the argument is well calculated utterly to destroy the confidence of our people in the divine source of the messages which for more than half a century have been coming to us through one who has been recognized by us as one to whom has been imparted the prophetic gift.

At the close of his argument Elder Jones says: "Possibly some may say that what I have written does of itself repudiate the Testimonies. With me it does not." To



us this statement seems utterly inconsistent with the arguments he has made; but it is a complete fulfilment of the statement made by the Testimonies: "Very adroitly some have been working to make of no effect the Testimonies of warning and reproof that have stood the test for half a century. At the same time, they deny doing any such thing."—"*Testimonies for the Church*," Series B, No. 7, page 31.

The question is dealt with under two phases: First, the disloyalty of the General Conference Committee—at least a part of the Committee—to the Testimonies; second, the unreliability of the Testimonies—at least of some of them. This argument demands a more lengthy reply than can possibly be given in a small tract; but we shall give it enough attention to throw some light on the dark picture presented to us.

The writer's position will be stated in his own language; the points reviewed will be taken in the order in which they occur. The subject is introduced as follows:—

"I know that you and others with you are making much of 'loyalty to the Testimonies,' and are not slow to convey the impression that any who do not openly endorse your course in the use of *some* of the Testimonies is *not* 'loyal to the Testimonies,' 'does not believe the Testimonies,' etc., etc. But all of that proves nothing at all as to anybody's loyalty or disloyalty to the Testimonies. Besides, facts within my personal knowledge demonstrate that the 'loyalty to the Testimonies' that is just now being made so conspicuous, is a very uncertain thing: it is merely 'loyalty' to *some* of the Testimonies—that can be used to special advantage for a purpose."

## THE BATTLE CREEK COLLEGE DEBT

In proof of his assertions, the following statement is made by Elder Jones concerning the Battle Creek College debt:—

“During the General Conference council in Washington in October, 1903, a Testimony came concerning the Battle Creek College debt, and the Acre Fund to pay that debt. That Testimony said: ‘How pleasing to God it would be for all our people—*led and encouraged by the General Conference Committee*—to share in lifting this obligation of the old Battle Creek College!’

“‘The creditors of Battle Creek College must all be paid. *The officers of the General Conference should lend a hand in this work.*’

“I was in a position to know full well that the General Conference Committee neither led nor encouraged the people in that thing at all. Indeed their leading and encouraging was against it rather than for it. Also I personally know that ‘the officers of the General Conference’ did not lend any hand in that work. Indeed they were not at all ready even to print that Testimony in the *Review*. They did by special request, if not persuasion, promise in the *Review* of October 29, to publish it ‘next week;’ but in fact did not publish it until five weeks afterward, December 3, *and then with changes*, showing that it had either been sent to California for these changes and back again, or else another copy was received from California to be published in place of the one that they promised October 29 to publish ‘next week.’ Any or all of which shows that loyalty to *that Testimony* was not at all conspicuous on the part of the General Conference officers.”

The writer of these criticisms of the General Conference Committee assumes to know all about what the Committee have done, and what they have failed to do. He asserts that they have not only failed to heed the in-

struction given, but have worked against it. If he or any one else will read the instruction with care, and then trace with equal care all that the General Conference Committee have done in behalf of the Battle Creek College obligations, it will be found that the instruction has been complied with. It may not have been at the exact time and in the precise way Elder Jones assumes to know that it should have been done; but it has been carried out the very best the Committee have known how. They have shared in lifting the obligations, and have secured every creditor by giving to each one General Conference notes. It should be remembered that for a long time conditions have been very complicated. Rapid and radical changes have taken place, which have brought great perplexity upon the Committee. At times they have not known how to move, but they have not knowingly rejected any Testimony.

It is true that the *Review* of October 29 announced that the communication referred to above would appear "next week." It is also true that it did not appear until five weeks later, December 3. But this does not necessarily prove disloyalty to the Testimonies. It does not even prove a lack of loyalty. There were good reasons for this. These are given in the following statement by Brother C. C. Crisler, who assists Sister White in her work, and is familiar with all the circumstances referred to:—

A STATEMENT REGARDING THE ARTICLE, "THE BATTLE CREEK COLLEGE DEBT"

"Early in October, 1903, Professor P. T. Magan came to St. Helena, Cal. During his visit, many matters were discussed; among others, plans for the payment of the debt on the old Battle Creek College property. Sister White had already written out some instruction regarding this matter; and just before he left, she placed in his

hands copy of a manuscript entitled, 'The Battle Creek College Debt.' This copy had been hastily typewritten, and only a letter-press copy was kept for reference and recopying. No MS. number was placed on the copy given him, and the document was unsigned.

"Afterward, duplicate copies were made, numbered, and placed on file. But meanwhile, Brother Magan had gone on to Washington, D. C., and had submitted the MS. to the editors of the *Review* for publication.

"The editors hesitated,—and not without cause. They understand full well Sister White's desire that they publish only such matter as she designates as intended for publication; and, having no definite knowledge of her wishes in this matter, and noticing that the MS. bore neither file number nor signature, they thought best to defer publication until they could obtain more full information regarding her wishes concerning the MS. in question. .

"In response to their inquiry, Sister White instructed them to wait until she could send a more complete article for publication. This article was prepared as soon as the press of other work would allow, and was forwarded to Washington. It appeared in the *Review* bearing date of December 3, 1903.

"The original MS. entitled 'The Battle Creek College Debt' was written late in the evening of October 8. Several days elapsed before the MS. was presented to the brethren in Washington. Then more time was consumed in writing back to California for definite instruction. Despite these necessary delays, the article would have appeared even earlier than December 3, had it not been for the fact that Sister White, the General Conference officers, State Conference officers, and the managers of our publishing houses were just then unitedly putting forth a tremendous effort in behalf of the Fall Missionary Campaign. Specially prepared articles from the pen of Sister White had been furnished for publication during the campaign, and it was deemed advisable to publish the

appeal regarding the Battle Creek College debt at a time when this appeal would not be largely neutralized by the simultaneous appearance of strong appeals for other enterprises.

"Taking all these matters into account, it is not at all singular that several weeks elapsed from the time the first incomplete MS. was written to the time when the article as finally completed was published in the *Review and Herald*.

"(Signed) CLARENCE C. CRISLER."

---

### THE BERRIEN SPRINGS MEETING

Another instance cited to prove that the General Conference Committee is not loyal to the Testimonies is a circumstance connected with the Berrien Springs meeting in 1904. Referring to this, Elder Jones says:—

"At Berrien Springs in May, 1904, a written Testimony was given to you personally, addressed 'Dear Brethren Daniells and Prescott,' in which were the following words:—

"'Last night I saw a hand stretched out to clasp his [Dr. Kellogg's] hand, and the words were spoken: "Let him take hold of my strength, that he may make peace with *me*, and he shall make peace with me. Satan is striving for the victory. I will help Dr. Kellogg to stand on vantage ground, and every soul who loves me must work with me. As he sees me do, so he must do."'

"You received that Testimony on Friday. Yet as late as Monday following, Dr. Kellogg knew nothing of it—at least so far as you were concerned—and he was there the most of the time. And when on Monday morning I read the Testimony openly in the morning meeting, you said that you had received it on Friday, but 'did not know what to do with it.' It would seem that loyalty to the

Testimonies would have given to you plainly to know what to do *yourself*; whether you knew what to do *with it* or not. It would seem that loyalty to the Testimonies would have caused you to go straight to Dr. Kellogg and stretch out your hand to him, as the Testimony told you to do. But you did not do it then; and when I asked you in Battle Creek last month whether you had ever done it, you were obliged to say 'No.' Is *that* loyalty to the Testimonies, or is it merely 'loyalty to the Testimonies'?"

The best explanation that can be given to all that was involved in the matter referred to above is the one which has been given us through the spirit of prophecy. This will be found in "Testimonies, Series B, No. 2," in the chapter entitled "The Berrien Springs Meeting." Among other statements made in this communication are these:—

"A glorious victory might have been gained at the Berrien Springs meeting. Abundant grace was provided for all who felt their need. But at a critical time in the meeting unadvised moves were made, which confused minds and brought in controversy. The Lord was working upon minds. Angels of God were in the assembly, and had all heeded the message borne, very different results would have been seen. Had all freely confessed their own sins, laying aside all anxiety about the acknowledgments and confessions to be made by others; had all humbled their hearts before God, as on the day of atonement in the days of ancient Israel, the Lord would have come in, and great victories would have been gained.

"But in the scenes presented to me, I saw men talking together between the meetings about the mistakes and faults of their brethren. In the place of searching their own hearts, and praying, and confessing their own mistakes, men seemed to be anxious that others should feel that they had acted unwisely. Angels from heaven, sent to minister wisdom and grace, were disappointed to see self pressing its way in, to make things appear in a wrong

light. Men were talking and accusing, and conjectures were brought in that should have had no place in the meeting."

"Brother A. T. Jones acted unwisely. He acted in the light of another's mind. He introduced matters that he would not have touched had he been wholly worked by the Spirit of God."

---

## FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR NASHVILLE

Further evidence cited by Elder Jones in proof that the General Conference Committee are not loyal to the Testimonies, is the question of providing five thousand dollars for the work in Nashville. He says:—

"Sister White says that in the time of the General Conference of 1905, at Takoma Park, Washington, she was shown in the night the needs of the South, and that five thousand dollars must be given immediately to the brethren—Butler and Haskell—for it. So plain was this and so urgent, that she said to Brother Haskell the next morning, 'Have faith in God. You will carry five thousand dollars from this meeting' for the work in the South. Then the Testimony proceeds: 'But Willie said' that Brother Daniells was very much perplexed with the conditions in Battle Creek, and the money could not be sent just then; and, 'I said no more about it.' This Testimony you have there in Washington.

"Now, *did* she *see* that night, as she says that she did, the needs of the South and so urgent that five thousand dollars should be carried from that very meeting for it? If she did, then how much loyalty to the Testimonies was there in 'Willie's' setting it all aside so effectually that for full *two months* nothing at all was done in that direction, and when *after* full two months something was done, it was only because Testimonies were sent to the South as well as to Washington that would brook no more delay. And one of these said:—

“‘This matter has been presented to me three times, and I was instructed that five thousand dollars ought to have been placed in Elder Haskell’s hands before he left the Conference grounds.’

“That is exactly the instruction that she says that she had on the Conference grounds, in the time of the Conference. She gave ‘instruction,’ at least to Brother Haskell and to ‘Willie.’ But ‘Willie’ simply and promptly set it aside. Now was that instruction from the Lord, or was it not? If it was, how much did ‘Willie’ care for it? Allowing what he said about conditions in Battle Creek, is it not possible that the Lord knew of this, and knew as much about it as ‘Willie’ did? Or, is it true that ‘Willie’ is the supreme source of knowledge and understanding in the work of the Lord—even above and against the instruction of the Lord? Or did ‘Willie’ believe a particle in that instruction’s having come from the Lord? If it was from the Lord, then how much loyalty to the Testimonies had ‘Willie’ when he set it aside? If it was from the Lord, and yet *he did not believe that it was from the Lord*, then how much loyalty to the Testimonies was there in what he did? Or shall it be said that it was not from the Lord, and was not Testimony, till it came out in *writing* on July 19, 20, full two months afterward? But if it was from the Lord when it was written out two months afterward, then was it not equally from the Lord when it was spoken to ‘Willie’ at the time? And in any case where in ‘Willie’s’ course in that matter does there appear any faintest suggestion of any real loyalty to the Testimonies?

“By the way, Brother, why haven’t you printed those two Testimonies of July 19, 20, 1905, in full; full names and all, in the *Review and Herald* or in some ‘Series A, B, or Z, No.’ something? For *all the people* to have those Testimonies, *just as they are*, would do a lot of good to the work in the South; why not print them?

“Now, please, Brother Daniells, I am not involving



you in 'Willie's' course in the foregoing matter. I am perfectly willing to believe that he did not allow that word to get to you, as to the five thousand dollars going with Brother Haskell from that General Conference. The point that I make upon it is this: that is the course which 'Willie' took on that; *the Testimony says so*. Now since he can do such things as that, and at the same time is heartily and companionably fellowshiped by you as 'loyal to the Testimonies,' how is it that you can not just as heartily fellowship men who have far more respect for the Testimonies than that, but who possibly can not near as loudly urge upon *other people* 'loyalty to the Testimonies'?"

The following statement concerning this matter is given by Elder W. C. White:—

SOME FACTS CONCERNING SISTER WHITE'S REQUEST THAT  
\$5,000 OF THE OVERFLOW OF THE WASHINGTON  
FUND BE SENT TO NASHVILLE

"During the last days of the General Conference, and for several days after its close, mother's time and strength were severely taxed.

"There were present at the Conference many old friends and fellow laborers from distant fields, whom she wished to see before their return to foreign lands. And there were many from far and near who were asking for interviews with her.

"At the same time, mother was carrying on her heart the burden of the Loma Linda proposition, and the burden of the great needs of the Southern field.

"Early in the morning she would begin to write out some counsels for the church, and would sometimes express her anxiety to complete the writing before other matters pressed in to divert her mind, but only occasionally was she permitted to have the early morning hours undisturbed. I had a long list of requests for interviews, and

I pressed them in just as fast as her strength would permit.

"On Tuesday, the day following the close of the Conference, May 31, mother wrote a brief note to Elder Daniells, asking that five thousand dollars be placed in the hands of Elder Haskell before he left the meeting, to be used in purchasing the Nashville meeting-house.

"Some time Tuesday or Wednesday this note was handed to me with the request that I read it, and hand it to Elder Daniells. This note had been hastily written, and was difficult to read, and I could not then get it copied. I asked permission to delay till it could be copied. Afterward I told mother some of the perplexities that were upon us regarding money matters, such as the many pressing needs of the South for means, the argument that the General Conference ought to help several sanitariums, and the feeling on the part of the treasurer, that we should call a halt in institutional expenditures. I also told her that a subcommittee was working out propositions in behalf of the whole Southern field, and that I wished that we could avoid asking for so large a sum to be paid out in advance for the meeting-house. I told mother that it seemed evident from Elder Haskell's statement, that \$1,000 paid down would secure the meeting-house. I also called attention to the fact that we were planning to call for gifts from our people everywhere to pay for the Nashville meeting-house, and that it would seem to take the strength out of the appeal if the meeting-house was fully paid for in advance.

"After hearing of our perplexities and our plans, mother told me I need not deliver the note to Elder Daniells.

"Near the close of the General Conference, probably the night of May 30, a scene was presented to mother, as described in her letter to Elders Evans and Washburn, of July 19, 1905, in which after a council meeting, it was announced that the Washington Fund was made up, and that there were several thousands of dollars overflow.

Then a praise service was held, and after this arrangements were made for \$5,000 of the overflow to go to the meeting-house in Nashville.

"In the light of this vision mother had a long talk with Elder Haskell, and told him that he would no doubt carry \$5,000 with him from the meeting. She also had a talk with Elder Butler, and told him she intended to have a plain talk with the officers of the General Conference, regarding their duty toward the Southern field.

"But the demands upon mother's time and strength, in the farewell interviews of the Conference closing were so taxing, that she evidently forgot her promise to Elder Butler, and the interviews which she planned to hold with the brethren regarding the Southern work were never held.

"It is probably for the same reason, that mother never mentioned to me or to any of us, as far as I can ascertain, except to Elder and Mrs. Haskell, what had been shown her about the sending of \$5,000 to Nashville.

"Sunday morning, June 5, Elder Haskell asked me to present to the General Conference Committee his request for money to secure the Nashville meeting-house. I consented, and suggested that he put the request in writing. This he did, and when I saw the request was for \$5,000, instead of \$1,000 as I had understood it to be, I objected to presenting it, and Elder Haskell rearranged his plans so as to be able to present it himself. Elder Haskell seemed to be confident that he ought to have, and would have, \$5,000.

"How it happened that he did not tell us what mother told him, I never understood. Probably he took it for granted that mother had told us or written it out.

"Five or six weeks later, mother wrote out the whole matter clearly in her letters of July 19 and 20 to Elders Evans and Washburn, and to the General Conference Committee.

"As soon as I saw these letters, I encouraged our

brethren in Washington to act upon the counsel without delay, and although the Review and Herald was sorely in need of the funds, its board of trustees quickly turned over \$5,000 to the Southern Union Conference for the Nashville work.

"In my letter to Professor Prescott, written August 11, 1905, I referred to this matter as follows:—

"When mother began to write about the matter here in California, I was greatly surprised. At first I could not understand it, but as she continued to write, the matter cleared up, and I am prepared to stand firmly with you and share the responsibility of doing what we are bidden to do, that is, to send the first \$5,000 overflow to Nashville.

"I can understand the disappointment and perplexity this will bring to you and to your associates on the Review and Herald Board, if you look at it from a business standpoint. I am inclined to believe, Brother Prescott, that it would be right for us to look at this as we do at the action of the widow who was going out to gather two sticks to bake a cake for herself and her son, and was told by Elijah to bring him a little cake first. And I believe with all my heart that if we receive this request and act upon it as the widow did, we shall receive the blessing of obedience. I know that it is in the power of God to work for us to-day as he worked for the widow in Elijah's day.

"You and I know that in the past some very singular requests have come from mother to the Battle Creek Sanitarium and the Review and Herald to assist our work in Australia. To me these requests seemed strange at the time, but later on we were told that they were tests, and we have seen the two institutions which refused to respond to these requests pass through strange experiences. Brother Prescott, I long to see our institutions enjoying the opposite experiences, and it is my belief that cheerful obedience to the calls of God in the face of opposing sur-

roundings will open the way for him to work for us and to save us from all our fears.

“I have always felt that it was right for the Washington Fund, in behalf of the sanitarium, school, and General Conference buildings, to be closed with the \$100,000. I have always felt that it was right for \$15,000 of the overflow to go to the Review and Herald. I am still of that opinion. But when we are plainly told that the first \$5,000 should go to Nashville, I must cheerfully accept that as the better plan and higher wisdom than any of my own, and when I accept that, I also believe that God is able to make up to us the \$15,000 for the Review and Herald in his own time and in his own way.”

“(Signed) W. C. WHITE.”

These statements show clearly that Elder W. C. White does believe the Testimonies, and that the General Conference Committee and the members of the Review and Herald Board believe them, and act upon them promptly. The fact that the money was sent as soon as the Testimony was received is good evidence of what would have been done at the close of the General Conference, if all had then fully understood the matter. The charges made by Elder Jones, which, if true, would in no way invalidate the truthfulness of the Testimonies, are shown to be utterly groundless.

The sarcastic and belittling manner in which Elder Jones refers to Elder W. C. White, a brother in the gospel ministry, is undignified, belittling to himself, and is wanting in common Christian courtesy, and deserving of rebuke. The relation which Elder White bears to the one whom the Lord has chosen as his instrument of communication with his remnant people is an important one. The Lord has plainly indicated, through the Testimonies, that he has called him to occupy this responsible and difficult position. For this reason, if for no other, he should be treated with respect and kindness by his fellow laborers.

## PERSONAL

In view of the light in which Elder Jones's unfriendly criticisms place Elder W. C. White, I feel it to be a duty, and esteem it a privilege as well, to say a few words of a personal nature regarding Brother White.

For nearly fifteen years it has been my privilege to be closely associated in gospel work with Elder White. More than half of this time we were in the Australasian field. At first the staff of general workers in that country was small. This made it necessary for us to counsel frequently and to work together in all parts of the field, and in all phases of the work. In developing and organizing conferences in new colonies, and in establishing such enterprises as the school and sanitarium, we were kept face to face much of the time with great difficulties and perplexities.

At times we differed in opinion regarding plans and policies. Many were the hours we spent in the woods together in earnest prayer for divine guidance. And many times we sought and received counsel from Sister White. At first I questioned whether Brother White might not take advantage of his relationship to Sister White to secure support for his plans where they differed from mine. This led me to watch his movements very closely until I became thoroughly convinced and satisfied that he was open, fair, and conscientious in his methods. I observed that he took particular pains to give me every opportunity to make my plans clear, and to make the fullest inquiry of Sister White regarding every feature of the question before us. And I always found him ready to change his position, and abandon his most cherished plans when the counsel Sister White gave showed they were wrong.

And now, after many years of very intimate association with Brother and Sister White in their work, I can truthfully and conscientiously say to all our people, and to the world, that what I have seen leaves my confidence

unshaken in the source from which the Testimonies come, and the conscientious, honest manner in which they are prepared and sent out.

This makes it impossible for me to accept the unfriendly criticisms which are being so industriously circulated at the present time. I do not believe that they are fair or just.

All who are acquainted with Sister White's work know that her burdens are many and heavy. Her life is full of great perplexities and sorrows. Since the Lord permitted her husband to be removed from her side, she has been instructed by the Lord that her son, W. C. White, is to stand by her as a counselor and helper. This she has plainly stated many times.

The position in which the Lord has thus placed Brother White is a very difficult and trying one. He is human, and fallible like the rest of us. But the Lord knew this when he placed him where he is, and has helped him to bear the burdens and do the work assigned him. He needs the prayers, sympathy, and co-operation of this people, rather than their unfriendly criticism and contempt.

It is greatly to be deplored that Elder Jones has felt it to be his duty to scatter broadcast throughout this denomination statements and insinuations regarding Elder White that are calculated to destroy confidence in his work. We mistake our people very much if they do not in their hearts raise a solemn protest against this wrong.

A. G. DANIELLS.

---

"Great trials are right upon us, to test every soul. The end of the world is near at hand."

## LOCATION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF 1903

Elder Jones claims that not only the General Conference Committee is free to disregard the Testimonies, but that Sister White also disregards them. He endeavors to show that they contain such contradictions and mistakes that they are rendered unreliable, and can not be followed; and as evidence he gives the following statement regarding the location of the General Conference of 1903:—

“The General Conference was to be held in California in 1903. I was then president of the California Conference. We spent much time in considering and deciding the question as to the place where the Conference should be held—Sacramento, Fresno, Oakland, Healdsburg. It was finally decided that it should be held in Oakland. After that there came to me a written communication from Sister White, saying that if the Healdsburg church would entertain the delegation, Healdsburg was the better place than Oakland to hold the Conference; and that this would be according to the light to get out of the cities to the quiet of the country. The matter was presented to the Healdsburg church. They gladly agreed to entertain the delegation, and began immediately to arrange for the holding of the Conference there; and the arrangements for and by Oakland were dropped. But not long afterward we learned that Sister White had given directions to prepare for her a house in Oakland during the Conference. We at Healdsburg could not believe it. Not long afterward I went from Healdsburg to the St. Helena Sanitarium, and there I learned that it was true concerning the getting ready of a house in Oakland for her during the coming General Conference. Then I had several of the Oakland brethren to come up to St. Helena Sanitarium to consider the matter, with Sister White present. Without any other writing it was very readily decided



that the General Conference should be in Oakland; and the Healdsburg church, their committees and other arrangements, and the writing that said that the Conference should be held there as 'in harmony with the light,' etc. were all just as readily ignored. The matter of where the Conference should be held was nothing to me personally; and I let it all go without any further discussion, except that I said to W. C. White shortly afterward, 'Will, what does this mean? I have supposed that when a thing was written and sent out, it was final and was to be accepted and followed. And now here is this writing saying what it does, but counted as nothing. Was that thing true when it was sent to me at Healdsburg?' His answer was, 'It depends on the information that she had.' Before this I knew by many experiences with him that he cared nothing for a communication from that source *after* it was written and sent out, if it did not meet his mind; but I never did know before that the thing went back to the very source itself, and made the trustworthiness of the communication to depend on 'the information that she had.'

"Now to you I say, What was that communication that was sent to me? The place of holding the Conference had already been decided to be Oakland. And to the ignoring of this communication, even by herself, the Conference *was held in Oakland.* Then what was the good of that communication, and what was the purpose of it, sent to me? In recognition of it the Oakland arrangements were thrown over, and Healdsburg arrangements were entered upon; then in the ignoring of it, Healdsburg arrangements were thrown over, and the Oakland arrangements, after having been so disconcerted, were all gathered up again and carried forward. Could we not all have done better than that without having that communication at all? If it had not come at all, we should have all gone on quietly and steadily with the arrangements for Oakland, and the Conference would have been held in Oakland, *just where it was held anyhow.* What then was that communication?

Was it a Testimony, or was it not? If it was, then why was it disregarded by her? If it was not, then why was it sent to me, only to create unnecessary confusion; or why was it written at all?"

The above positive and unqualified assertions certainly place the Testimonies, W. C. White, and Sister White herself, in a very unfavorable light. Are these statements true? The best and most satisfactory answer that can be made is the communication itself to which reference is made. A careful comparison of the communication with what Elder Jones says, will show that he has made the following incorrect representations:—

1. It is not true, as his statement represents, that the initiative in the proposal to change the place of holding the Conference from Oakland to Healdsburg was taken by Sister White; for her letter shows conclusively that before she wrote Elder Jones, the Healdsburg church had considered the matter, had decided to furnish free entertainment, and had communicated their action and desire to Sister White.

2. Sister White did not claim to have special instruction from the Lord that the General Conference should be held in Healdsburg; neither did she say that it should be held there. Therefore it is not true that she "readily ignored" what she had written.

3. The brethren asked if she had any "preference to express." Having stated how she would feel personally about the matter, providing the Healdsburg church would furnish free entertainment, she said, "I desire my *personal preferences* to have *no special influence* in determining where the Conference shall be held." Instead of saying where it should be held, she plainly expressed the desire that her personal preference should have "no special influence" in deciding the question, and left the matter wholly with the brethren.

All this is made plain by the following communication to which Elder Jones refers:—

“‘ELMSHAVEN,’ SANITARIUM, CALIFORNIA,

“January 27, 1903.

“Alonzo T. Jones, C. H. Jones, and M. C. Wilcox,

“My dear brethren in positions of trust,—

“I received your letter this morning, and will respond at once.

“Brother Harper came to St. Helena last week especially to lay before me the question of the location of the General Conference soon to be held. He told me that the brethren and sisters of the Healdsburg church offered to entertain the delegates free of cost, if the General Conference would be held there. He asked if I had any preference to express. I told him that if the Healdsburg church proposed to entertain the delegates free, the Conference would be held at Healdsburg, if I had any voice in deciding the matter; for to hold it there would be much more in accordance with the light given to leave the cities as much as possible, than holding it in Oakland would be.

“I thought that if the brethren and sisters at Healdsburg would do what I was told they were so desirous of doing, to hold the Conference there would be much more desirable than to hold it in Oakland at this time of the year. I knew that accommodations in Oakland for entertaining so large a company were very limited, and expensive.

“I desire my personal preferences to have no special influence in determining where the Conference shall be held; for unless especially convinced by the Spirit of the Lord that it is my duty to be present, I will not attend, no matter where the meeting may be held. If I knew that I should have to attend the Conference, I might express my preference for Healdsburg as the location; for I could drive over, and have my horse and carriage there to use at any time, and to return when necessary.

“ (Signed) ELLEN G. WHITE.”

The glaring discrepancies which appear in this instance between what the Testimonies really *say* and what Elder Jones *says* they say, are to be seen in all his arguments that follow. He tells us that he has changed his belief respecting the Testimonies; that he can not believe them now as he once did, and cites as a reason certain Testimonies which he claims contain plain contradictions. But, when these very Testimonies themselves are produced in which the alleged contradictions occur, no such contradictions appear. We invite particular attention to this fact as we examine each of the charges which he prefers against the Testimonies. One of two things is certainly true; either Elder Jones has quoted from memory, or he has knowingly perverted the plain statements of the Testimonies. He can impale himself on either horn of this dilemma he chooses. For ourselves we are loth to believe that he knowingly perverted them. And the seriousness, in this instance, of misquoting, even unintentionally, leads us to admonish him to study the following advice which he gave the Sanitarium family in an address delivered February 4, 1906. He said:—

“Let me give you a little practise lesson. Just watch, and practise on yourself, and see how downright hard it is to tell a thing exactly as you hear it. . . . Just take that for a task, brethren, and practise trying to tell, not to other people, but to yourself, just the words that were said. When you get it so that you can do it exactly, by that time you will have enough practise that you will not try to do it at all.”

He will never be able to find in the Testimonies some of the things he says are there. Are we as a people going to abandon our confidence in the Testimonies on the mere assertions and quotations from memory of those who are opposing them?

There is one very noticeable difference in Elder Jones's style of writing in this leaflet from his style in the past. Formerly he was very particular and exact in making quo-

tations of the words and writings of others, as well as in giving the references to them. In his present effort to prove that the Testimonies are unreliable he has departed widely from this custom, and manifested an inexcusable recklessness.

In dealing with this most important question, he asserts, in a general way, that the Testimonies say certain things; often we are not told where. The most meager quotations are given, and few references cited. In the foregoing instance he made one effort to give a quotation from the Testimony, enclosing five words in quotation marks. But on examination, these five words are found to be incorrectly quoted, as will be seen by reading the communication itself. In his present open attack upon the Testimonies, he clearly proves the truthfulness of one given August 1, 1904, which says: "Our Counselor then laid his hands on the shoulders of Elders A. T. Jones and —, and said, 'You are confused. You are in the mist and fog. You have need of the heavenly anointing.'"

As further evidence of the true position Sister White held regarding this question, we give the following statement which she sent to the President of the General Conference:—

" 'ELMSHAVEN,' SANITARIUM, CALIFORNIA,

" January 23, 1903.

" Elder A. G. Daniells,

" Washington, D. C.

" Dear Brother,—

" Yesterday the question as to where the General Conference should be held was brought before me, and an urgent petition was made that it be held in Healdsburg. The Healdsburg church say that they will entertain the delegates free of charge, and they are very anxious that the meeting be held there. I did not know until recently that they thought they would be able to entertain the

delegates; but they say they can do this, and they wish me to use my influence to have the meeting held there.

"Seeing that the church is willing to entertain the delegates free of charge, would it not be better to hold the Conference in Healdsburg instead of in Oakland? The meeting will not be as large as the last General Conference, and I think that perhaps Healdsburg would be a more favorable place than Oakland. But I merely present the earnest petition of the Healdsburg church, as I was requested to tell you of their great desire that the meeting be held in that place.

"For myself, I have little to say about where the Conference should be held; for it is a question with me whether I shall attend at all. I have been and I am still carrying very heavy burdens, and I want no more. My soul is sick and discouraged at the outlook.

"I will say no more. Only I can not see why, since Healdsburg pleads so hard for the Conference, it can not be held there. I know that it would be very difficult to find accommodation for all the delegates in Oakland; for every nook and corner seems to be filled.

"Please understand that, in referring to this matter, I am speaking for others, not for myself; for I do not expect to attend the Conference.

"(Signed) ELLEN G. WHITE."

---

#### ALLEGED OVERDRAFT OF \$300 BY THE PRESIDENT OF AN INSTITUTION

Elder Jones cites the following as an instance in support of his claim that some at least of the Testimonies can not be accepted as Testimonies from the Lord because of the false statements and serious misrepresentations they contain:—

"I was a member of the Board of a certain institution. Upon due consideration that Board had arranged that the president of the Board should do certain work in the field. A communication from Sister White came to the Board, through the president of the Board, saying that a member of the Board had told her that this brother, the president of the Board, had 'overdrawn his account' with the institution 'three hundred dollars;' that in the night things were 'opened' to her; and that the action which the Board had taken with reference to the work of the president of the Board should not be carried out; with much more to the same effect. The members of the Board were scattered; the president of the Board was in the field in the work which the Board had arranged for him to do; and it was some weeks — two or possibly three — before a meeting of the Board could be held. But before this meeting of the Board was held, there came another communication referring to the main point in the previous one, saying that the matter had 'not been repeated' and that there was no reason why the action of the Board should not be carried out as originally planned. When the Board met, the president of the Board laid before it the first communication. When that part was read as to his having 'overdrawn his account three hundred dollars,' the secretary of the Board and bookkeeper of the institution spoke out with the words: 'Why, Brother — *has no account with the institution.* The institution does not even pay his wages.' And this was literally true. And it was just as literally true that the president of the Board had not 'overdrawn his account three hundred dollars.' It was literally true that he had not even *drawn* a cent, much less 'overdrawn three hundred dollars.'

"Now was that communication a Testimony? It came as a Testimony; it spoke authoritatively as a Testimony; was it a Testimony? The material statement and basis of the communication was not true and never had been true. Could that Board receive that communication as a

Testimony from the Lord? Should they have received it so? If so, how could it be done?

“Possibly it may be argued that since, before it reached the Board it was practically reversed by the one that followed, of course it was not a Testimony then. But if it were not a Testimony *then*, was it ever a Testimony? Besides, the one that followed had not yet been read to the Board; they were read in the order given. The Board did not yet know that the second one existed. And more than this, the second one, even when it was issued, was not issued for a considerable time—days, or a week, possibly more—after the first one had been sent; and the president of the Board in the field had it for the Board this considerable time before the second one came. And during this time what was he to do? Must he receive it as a Testimony, knowing it was not true; and then when the second one came, let the first one pass as *not* Testimony? And then again, If the first one was not Testimony after the second one came, was it ever Testimony? And since it was mistaken and wrong in its very basis, then why was it ever issued as a Testimony?

“Will it be said: ‘But did she not have the word of a member of the Board?’ Yes, she did; but is *that*, and such as that, a sufficient source and basis of the Testimonies? Is *that*, and such as that, a sufficient source of a ‘Testimony from the Lord,’ ‘every word of it given by the Spirit of God,’ and ‘If I did not believe that, I would give up the whole thing!’? etc., etc. Yes, she did have the word—the prejudiced gossip—of that member of the Board. It was not true, but she believed it. And believing it, and her mind being agitated by her believing it, the communication said that in the night things ‘were opened’ to her, and the instruction of the communication followed, that a considerable time afterward was reversed because it had not been ‘repeated.’ And the unquestionable facts in the case make it certain that on the mere prejudiced report of a man, a communi-



cation was issued as a Testimony, because of that report of 'a member of the Board' and of things 'opened' to her in the night seasons,—a communication as a Testimony, whose basic premise was not in any sense nor on any ground true; and which itself was afterward reversed, by another communication. The man's story was made up from a willing jumping to premise and conclusion, from the following circumstances:—

"The institution had engaged to print a book for the president of the Board. The paper to print the book had cost *three hundred dollars*. In making up the inventory for the annual report to show the actual standing, that paper was invoiced to the account of the president's book that was to be printed on it. But by no possibility could the president himself have any *account* in that connection, until the books should be printed and ready for delivery. Yet out of that perfectly innocent thing, and merely hearing the sound of the words in the annual report or in some other way, that newly elected 'member of the Board' told her that 'Brother —, the president of the Board, had overdrawn his account three hundred dollars.' And then the communication followed and the train of circumstances as given above, which absolutely demonstrate two things—(a) that not everything is Testimony that is issued as Testimony; and, (b) that a communication purporting to be a Testimony has been issued on the mere gossip of a man."

Closing his letter addressed to Elder Daniells (page 69), Elder Jones says: "You are at liberty to make this whole letter public in any way that you please, *provided* that you make the *whole letter* public at the same time and in the same way. I want that it shall not be used partially. I want that it or parts of it shall not be reported in snatches or by word of mouth."

But how differently he treats the Testimonies to the manner in which he wishes *his* communication assailing the Testimonies treated! As in the previous case, it will

be noticed that in this long, labored argument to disprove the reliability and truthfulness of the Testimonies, he does not quote the communications to which he refers, and upon which he bases his argument, and from which he draws his conclusion. For what the communications actually say, the reader is left to depend almost wholly upon what Elder Jones, in his own words, says they say. He does not even quote, nor does he pretend to quote, a single complete sentence from either of them. In all his long, drawn-out argument, he does not profess to give verbatim even a dozen words from them, but reports them in the most infinitesimal "parts" and "snatches." And, more astounding still, the one statement of six words which he *does* profess to quote,—the one he iterates and reiterates over and over again, and upon which he bases his entire argument,—is *not to be found in either of the communications he is reviewing*. It would seem that he has not only quoted from memory, but has manufactured a quotation which was never in the communications, and upon *this* reared his argument and staked his conclusion.

That he did not have the communications before him when he wrote, is evident; for he neither gives their dates, nor seems to know exactly the time intervening between the writing of the two, but says it was "a considerable time—days, or a week, possibly more."

In view of all this, we wish to ask if *that*, and such as that, is a fair way to deal with the Testimonies; and if *that*, and such as that, is a "sufficient basis" for giving up the Testimonies, and renouncing faith in them.

As the facts show, Elder Jones has "made up" his whole argument here "from a willing jumping to premise and conclusion," and has made the grave mistake of confounding conversation and "the mere gossip of a man" with the Testimonies. That he was conscious of not being absolutely certain as to the correctness of all the statements he has made in this leaflet, is apparent from the note he attached at the end of it, found on page 71, in

which he says: "There is a possibility that in some minor point or item of detail some statement in this leaflet may not be perfectly exact." This throws the shadow of indefiniteness, inaccuracy, and uncertainty over everything in the leaflet. It would have been well if this statement had been placed at the beginning of the document. But, knowing as he does the frailty of the memory and mind of man, it is surprising that Elder Jones should attempt to deal with so serious and important a subject as faith in the gift of the Spirit known in Scripture as "the testimony of Jesus," and "the spirit of prophecy," without being absolutely certain as to the correctness and truthfulness of his statements.

After reading his severe arraignment of the communications referred to, and these observations respecting it, it will doubtless be of interest and a matter of satisfaction to the reader to read the communications themselves, and compare them with the statements made concerning them. They are here reproduced as originally written, with the exception of the omission of names.

" 'ELMSHAVEN,' SANITARIUM, CAL.,

" Sept. 2, 1903.

" DEAR BROTHER —,

" I wrote something in regard to you, the night after you left —. Matters were opened before me, and I was instructed that you were correct in your statement to me that it would not be best to have two families serving in the same office of responsibility in the students' home. If Brother — and his wife should come in to serve in the place formerly occupied by yourself and wife, while you remained as an adviser, confusion would be liable to result.

" It might have been appropriate for you to accept the position of adviser, as recommended, if you had kept humble and very near the Lord. But, as I have stated,

such a plan is liable to result in confusion and unpleasantness.

"There are some things connected with financial matters that must be made perfectly straight before the Board, so that they can act intelligently. When I learned this, I could not see how the plan I proposed could be carried out successfully. You have not stood as you should have done in every respect. At twelve o'clock of the night after you left, I was up writing out some things to you. My heart aches; I feel sad that because of these things, matters can not be adjusted as I suggested in our conversation at —.

"I have not had the matter opened before me again as it was opened that night. I had almost decided not to write you anything more before there was a thorough investigation. Everything should be clearly and plainly defined. I supposed I had sent to you, at —, the letter that I wrote to you in —; but yesterday I found that the letter had not been copied. Immediately on my return from the school, I had to do much writing in order to warn our people to guard against making mistakes, and to encourage them to strengthen themselves in right principles.

"When I found this letter that I wrote in —, I thought that it might be best to wait until my son, W. C. W., could see you at —. I thought perhaps he might be there, although he did not write me that he would. I did not want to throw you into perplexity by telling you of the things that had been opened to me in the night season; namely, that it would be best to leave matters just as you proposed, because of the difficulties that would naturally arise if Brother — should serve in the position assigned him, while you were also occupying the position of adviser in the same place.

"These other matters, in regard to your course of action in managing financial matters, I knew nothing of when we talked together. These things will have to be

settled in some way satisfactory to all concerned. After the representations passed before me in the night season, I was troubled, and decided to send you a letter at once. Then I thought that nothing should be done hastily. I feared that unless these things were clearly understood, confusion would result from sending you a communication. I desired to carry no unnecessary burden. But now, since receiving your letter written from —, I feel as if I must speak.

“Inquiring of members of the Board, while in —, in regard to the future of the school, I was told that there are some matters concerning your disposition of college funds, that are not explained. Inquiries have come to me concerning similar matters elsewhere, and I have written out considerable instruction on this point. What I have written may possibly help you. I will send you this soon. It is not yet copied. Treat it not as personal, but as general matter. These principles that have been opened before me concern all who have any connection with our schools.

“Has everything in regard to yourself been made clear and straight? Some things may be made plain by the matter I have written in response to others whose minds were perplexed. Just at present I can not tax my mind further on this question, as I am carrying other burdens that demand immediate attention. I will try to write to you again to-morrow. I hope to be able to speak by my pen, so that matters will be understood.

“I am very, very sorry that all things are not satisfactory to our brethren. Make everything clear and straight. You can not afford to make any mistakes. At the present time I can not counsel you to take the position of influence suggested during our interview in —; for this would not be doing justice to Brother — and his wife. You thought so, I know; but I was fearful of making changes. I am not fearful now. I think a change should be made, and that unless it be made, unhappy re-

sults will follow. This much I can say. I must have clear light before I can say more.

"W. C. W. has telegraphed that he can not be here before September 10.

"May the Lord help and strengthen and bless you and your wife, is my prayer.

"(Signed) ELLEN G. WHITE."

---

"'ELMSHAVEN,' SANITARIUM, CAL.,

"Sept. 7, 1903.

"Elder, —,

"My dear Brother,—

"I am sorry that I could not see you. For some days I have been afflicted, and I hardly know how far I dare tax my strength by venturing to add to the perplexing burdens I am now carrying. My mind has been severely taxed of late.

"I believe that the position that the Board requested you to occupy, as the president of the Board, counselor in the school, and educational field worker, is the position that you should fill. You looked at this matter in the correct light when you talked with me before leaving —. But it would not be best for you and Brother — to live together in the students' home.

"Afterward, while I was speaking in reference to Brother and Sister — coming into the students' home and occupying there the position that you formerly occupied, I inquired in regard to the capabilities of Brother —, and learned that it was thought by the brethren that he would be capable of filling this place and meeting the responsibilities devolving upon the head of a school. Then some remarks were made by those who were talking to me, in regard to several matters connected with the past year's work. They said that you, Brother —, had overdrawn your account; and also that the Confer-

ence had been paying the traveling expenses of the canvassers who were selling 'Christ's Object Lessons,' which expenses were so great that almost as much was consumed as was produced. Statements were made, too, in regard to the use of funds to pay the debts of the school.

"In reply to these statements, I said that I did not know in regard to these particular things, but that I had received light on some points connected with the financial management of our schools. I did know that there should be no carelessness in the expenditure of means, but that everything connected with the finances of our schools should be perfectly straight.

"Some reflection was cast upon you, Brother —, by brethren interested in the — school. As I understand the matter, I can not see that they were justified in making such broad statements as were made.

"To the members of the Board I would say: I have no word of censure to speak against Brother —. Until these matters in question are closely and critically examined, let no reflection be suffered to rest upon him. Let him speak for himself.

"I have had matters presented to me in reference to the use of school funds at — college prior to the time that Brother — took the position of president of this school. But the misuse of funds in former years, before his administration, should not be regarded as casting a reflection upon him. If the Conference sanctioned those matters, and sanctioned paying from the tithe the expenses of those who were working in the interests of the 'Object Lessons' campaign, Brother — should not be blamed for mismanagement in these matters, whether the college received little or much from the efforts put forth.

"I write this statement, to be read to whomsoever it may concern. And I would say to my dear brethren, Do not call any council meetings of condemnation until you

know what you are about. I am sure that in all our management of institutional work, we need more of the Holy Spirit of God than we now have.

"I will try to write a few more lines soon.

" (Signed) ELLEN G. WHITE."

Five times Elder Jones repeats the statement that the first of these communications sets forth an alleged charge that the president of the board had "overdrawn his account three hundred dollars;" four times, in addition, he refers to the statement, and four times declares it to be false. Upon this he bases his argument.

But what are the facts? They are these: The first communication contains no such statement whatever. Elder Jones says "when that part was read as to his having overdrawn his account three hundred dollars," the bookkeeper made certain remarks. But no such statement was *read* from the first communication, for it contains no such statement. And yet Elder Jones claims that this is the "main point" of the first communication, dated September 2. Clearly, it is Elder Jones's statement, and not Sister White's, that, to use his own language, "in its very material statement," is "not true, and never was true."

As to the words "three hundred dollars," they can not be found in either communication. The expression "overdrawn your account" is found in the third paragraph of the second communication, the one dated September 7. But who said the words? Ans.—"They said,"—"those who were talking with me;" *i. e.*, certain members of the Board. And what, in this same communication, did Sister White say she said in reply? Ans.—"I said that I did not know in regard to these particular things. . . . As I understand the matter, I can not see that they were justified in making such broad statements as were made. . . . To the members of the Board I would say: I have *no word of censure* to speak



against Brother —. Until these matters in question are closely and critically examined, let *no reflection* be suffered to rest upon him."

If words can be taken to mean anything, these words show that Sister White did not either make or confirm the charge of an overdraft on the funds of the institution.

That there was a question on the part of some members of the Board regarding the use of the funds of the institution, is plain; and that there was need of the matter being explained and made clear and straight before all, is also apparent. And just this is what is expressed in the communications sent by Sister White to the president of the Board.

Regarding the prejudiced gossip which he claims Sister White believed, Elder Jones asks: "Is *that*, and such as that, a sufficient source and basis of the Testimonies?" The Testimonies already quoted clearly show that *that*, and such as that, was not the source of the Testimonies; but instead of Sister White believing that, and such as that, the Testimonies quoted above show that *that*, and such as that, was NOT believed. What, then, can be thought of that, and such as that, as a method of misrepresentation? The exact opposite of what the Testimonies say is assumed; upon that assumption a premise is based; upon that premise the proposition is stated; and from that the conclusion is drawn; and the conclusion is that "the unquestionable facts in the case make it certain that on the mere prejudiced report of a man, a communication was issued as a Testimony, because of that report of 'a member of the Board' and of things 'opened' to her in the night seasons,—a communication as a Testimony, whose basic premise was not in any sense nor on any ground true." But the premise could not be assumed if the Testimonies were quoted. The difficulty with Elder Jones, as well as with others who oppose the Testimonies, is that he does not quote the exact statement of the Testimonies, but says that they state thus and so. This is stated

with all positiveness, and with the assurance of a personal, intimate acquaintance with the matters involved.

Elder Jones states positively that Sister White believed the prejudiced gossip of a member of the Board regarding the overdraft of three hundred dollars by the president of the institution. But how does he know what she believed? That may be a pleasing assumption to him; but he is supposed to be stating facts; and the fact is that the communication itself, in referring to this charge by the member, says: "I said I did not know in regard to these particular things:" "I can not see how they were justified in making such broad statements as were made;" "I have no word of censure to speak against Brother ——."

Before making such sweeping charges against the reliability of the Testimonies, would it not be fair for Elder Jones to at least allow the Testimonies to speak for themselves, or if reference is made to them, to give the exact words which they contain? But were this done, his argument, founded on assumption and reared by forceful but false reasoning, would be impossible. Therefore, instead of giving the Testimonies themselves an opportunity to speak for themselves, or even to give a fair, truthful statement of what they do say, he assumes a false premise, and upon that erects a structure, only to be torn down at the first instant when the Testimonies are allowed to speak in their own defense.

Elder Jones makes frequent use of the term "opened" in the night season. The question arises, what are the matters referred to as having been opened in the night season? Here they are: "I did not want to throw you into perplexity by telling you of the things that had been opened to me in the night season,—namely, that it would be best to leave matters just as you proposed, because of the difficulties that would naturally arise if Brother —— should serve in the position assigned him, while you were also occupying the position of adviser in the same place." Not a word about overdrawing his account "three hun-

dred dollars." Strange, indeed, when that is said to be the "main point" in this, the first communication.

The very work outlined for the brother in this communication of September 2 is referred to again in the second communication, as follows: "I believe that the position that the Board requested you to occupy, as the president of the Board, counselor in the school, and educational field worker, is the position that you should fill." The two communications agree exactly in this and every other respect. They are practically one communication.

Elder Jones further states that the first communication was itself "afterward reversed by another communication." The communications are before the reader, and he will look in vain for the reversal.

This reference is made to these communications: "But before this meeting of the Board was held, there came another communication referring to the main point in the previous one, saying that the matter had 'not been repeated,' and that there was no reason why the action of the Board should not be carried out as originally planned."

The fact is that the *first* communication, the one dated September 2, 1903, is the one containing the statement to which reference is made above, and the statement is this: "I had not had the matter opened before me again as it was opened that night." No such statement can be found in the second communication, dated September 7. The statement which Elder Jones makes, as quoted above, is therefore incorrect.

---

## "SUPPRESSION" OF MATTER FOR VOL. VII

A further example cited by Elder Jones as proof of the unreliability of the Testimonies, is given in the following words:—

"Relative to your talk with Sister White in her house in the autumn of 1902, concerning the Southern Publishing

Company, when I and other General Conference men were present, you said in the Tabernacle when you were lately in Battle Creek that what she then said which was taken down in shorthand and run off and revised and approved by her and carried by you away from there for your use in the South—you said that *that* 'was not Testimony.' Very good. Let it be so. But I personally know, possibly you do not, that that is not all there is to that matter. Just at that time Volume VII of the Testimonies was being set up in type at the Pacific Press to be printed. In it there is a section on the Southern field and work. And the substance of at least a portion of that matter that you carried over here concerning the Southern Publishing Company, was sent to the Pacific Press as manuscript Testimony with the rest of the manuscript. But when the matter that you had carried over here was reversed, that substance of at least a portion of it that had been sent to the Pacific Press to be set up as Testimony *was also reversed*—a whole galley of it—after it had been put in type and was ready for making into pages. 'Now, if that which you carried over here had not been reversed, would not you have used it in the South as Testimony? When it was reversed, of course you could not. But was it Testimony till it was reversed and not afterward? And does a writing's being a Testimony or not, depend upon whether it is reversed or not? If that be so, I can understand your special emphasis on 'Testimonies up to the latest date.'

"At any rate you say now that the matter that you carried over here to be used in the South 'was not Testimony.' Very good. But what about the substance of a portion of the same conversation, if not of the same matter, that was sent to the Pacific Press as manuscript Testimony to be set up and published with the other as Testimony Vol. VII? What about that? Was *that* Testimony, till the matter and the situation were reversed? Was it Testimony when it was sent to the Pacific Press

as Testimony? Was it Testimony when the Pacific Press hands were putting it through as Testimony with the rest? Was it Testimony till it got clear through to the galley, ready for paging, and then did it suddenly cease to be Testimony before it got out of the galley, so that it never did get beyond the galley except to the melting-pot?

"That galley of reversed and suppressed matter I myself saw and read after Volume VII was issued. It was showed to me by a brother in prominent position, who knew the circumstances. And when I had read it and handed it back to him, he said: 'Brother Jones, that did not help the Pacific Press hands to have confidence in the Testimonies.'

"These and many other like things, are facts which unquestionably vitiate the claim that 'everything that she writes is from the Lord.' Yet these facts have been so forced upon my experience that I simply can not hide my eyes to them and be honest with myself and with the people, and at the same time hold before the people and urge upon them that everything that comes in writing from Sister White is Testimony from the Lord. Nor can I honestly stand with those who do that and allow my influence to be swung in urging upon the people that everything from that source is Testimony and the word of the Lord and the people thereby be rallied on 'loyalty to the Testimonies,' and thus drawn to the support of policies that otherwise they would not countenance at all, when I personally and reluctantly know by compulsory facts and experience that such statement or any such claim is simply not true."

STATEMENT BY ELDER DANIELLS

The following explanation regarding this matter is given by Elder Daniells:—

"In the fall of 1902 I was called to Nashville, Tenn., to counsel with the brethren regarding various interests.

Some of the questions with which we had to deal were too perplexing for us to settle, and as I was expecting to go to the Pacific Coast to attend the California camp-meeting, the brethren requested me to counsel with Sister White regarding some of these difficult problems. When I had my interview with her, there were present W. T. Knox, J. O. Corliss, A. T. Jones, W. C. White, and E. R. Palmer. In order to be able to convey to the brethren in the Southern field the exact counsel given by Sister White, the conversation was taken in shorthand, transcribed, and examined by Sister White. A copy was placed in my hands to read to the brethren in the South. Shortly after returning to Battle Creek, and before going South, I received a Testimony from Sister White, stating that the matters we had talked over in our personal interview had been presented to her in the night visions, and that it had been revealed to her that we had not taken a correct view of all the questions we had considered. She then outlined the situation as it was revealed to her. Of course I laid aside the document containing our conversation and the verbal counsel she gave, and took the Testimony containing the revelation that was given after our interview.

"This reminded me of David's experience with Nathan, as given to us in these words: 'David said to Nathan the prophet, Lo, I dwell in a house of cedars, but the ark of the covenant of the Lord remaineth under curtains. Then Nathan said unto David, *Do all that is in thine heart; for God is with thee.* And it came to pass the same night, that the word of God came to Nathan, saying, Go and tell David my servant, Thus saith the Lord, *Thou shalt not build me a house to dwell in.*'

"Now Elder Jones claims that either the document containing the account of our interview or the substance of the same was sent to the Pacific Press Publishing Company as Testimony to be printed in Volume VII. This matter he says was put in type, but before appearing in

the book it was set aside, and replaced by other matter. This, he claims, is all stated upon personal knowledge; for he says: 'That galley of reversed and suppressed matter I myself saw and read after Volume VII was issued. It was showed to me by a brother in prominent position who knew the circumstances.' These, he claims, are facts which unquestionably vitiate the claim that 'everything that she writes is from the Lord.' These, he affirms, are facts which are forced upon his experience, so that he can not hide his eyes to them and be honest with himself and with the people.

"Possibly there are some facts which have not come within his personal knowledge, and these may have some bearing upon the question. The transcript of the conversation which I had with Sister White covers seventeen typewritten pages, or a little more than 5,500 words. Elder Jones's claim is that 'a portion of that matter that you carried over here concerning the Southern Publishing Company, was sent to Pacific Press as manuscript Testimony with the rest of the manuscript,' was set up, and after it had been put into type ready for making into pages, was reversed upon the reversal of the matter, as he claims.

"The documents themselves are too lengthy to be printed in this connection; I will therefore state the facts just as they are. I have before me as I write, a copy of what Sister White said to me at the interview above referred to; I also have a copy of the galley-proof which Elder Jones says was reversed and suppressed. In this copy there are shown just the sentences that were omitted, and the words inserted to make proper connections. As the matter originally stood when first submitted to the Pacific Press for publication in Volume VII, there were 196 lines of typewritten matter, 118 of which were retained without a particle of change. Seventy-eight lines were rewritten or abbreviated. These changes were made by Sister White because she thought that with the

omission of certain statements commendatory and condemnatory regarding certain actions over which there was already too much dispute, the article would do more good in its abbreviated form.

"Elder Jones's contention is this: That 'a whole galley' was reversed and suppressed. But this is not true. The galley was neither reversed nor suppressed; it was revised. Of the 196 lines which it contained, 118 were printed without change; while the matter contained in seventy-eight lines was rewritten and abbreviated, for the reason stated.

"The crucial point of Elder Jones's claim is this: That because of the reversal and suppression of the matter contained in the interview, the matter that had been sent to the Pacific Press must also be suppressed; but a careful comparison of the report of the interview with Sister White, with the matter sent to the Pacific Press for publication in Volume VII, shows that there is nothing in it that appears like a compilation, a rewriting, an abbreviation, or the substance of the report of the interview with Sister White. Neither the portion abbreviated nor the part retained without change contains a single sentence, nor a clause, nor a phrase, nor even three words in consecutive order that are the same in the two manuscripts. To those who have carefully examined and compared these manuscripts such a claim is positively absurd.

"Thus it is shown that the report of my interview with Sister White regarding the Southern field was not used in the preparation of matter for Volume VII; that no part of it appears at any place in any article as originally prepared for publication in Volume VII, either in statement, form, substance, or compilation of any kind or manner whatsoever.

"(Signed) A. G. DANIELLS."



## "I AM NOT A PROPHET"

The report has been widely circulated that Sister White has openly stated that she is not a prophet. Elder Jones claims to have heard her make this statement, and makes the following argument regarding it:—

"There is another thing in this connection. You know that Sister White herself has said publicly, 'I am not a prophet, I never made any such claim.'

"I myself heard her say those words three times to the largest audiences that hear her—once at College View in September, 1904, and afterward twice in the Tabernacle at Battle Creek, when the Tabernacle was full of people, many of them outsiders. The statement was published in the *Review*; and if I remember rightly, was also sent from Washington to be published in the public paper of Battle Creek—the *Journal*.

"Now, how can you expect me in the face of this her own publicly repeated statement, to insist to all the people that she is a prophet, and put her writings on a level with those of Jeremiah and others of the Bible? I know that she said that. You know that she has said it. I can not assume to know more about that than she herself does. Nor am I prepared to say that she lied in saying it. And since I heard her repeatedly say it, and since she said it in print under her own name, I believe it. And since I believe it, how can you expect me to stultify myself, either by declaring, and preaching, and urging upon the people, that she is a prophet and that they must believe that she is; or by throwing my influence and personality in with those who do declare and preach and urge that?

"Other people, both at College View and in Battle Creek, who heard her say it, asked me at the time, 'What are we to do? We have believed all this time that she

was a prophet; that is what has been preached to us over and over; and now she says that she is not a prophet. What are we to do? What does she mean?' I told them that as for what she meant other than what she said, they would have to ask her. But as for what she had said, that was plain enough. She said, 'I am not a prophet.' I believe it.

"I know that the editor of the *Review*, against her own words that she is 'not a prophet,' undertook to prove that she is one; and either grossly misquoted, or else produced a strange translation, of the Scripture to sustain his contention. He had Amos to say, 'I am no prophet, neither am I a prophet's son,' etc. Amos 7: 14. I knew when I read it in the *Review*, that that was not the reading in the King James' Version; but I thought that possibly it might be the new way in the Revised Version. I therefore turned to the Revised, only to find that it emphasized the King James' Version. For whereas in the King James' Version the word 'was' is in italics in both places, in the Revised the 'was' is emphasized by being printed in Roman as the rest of the text. And this is manifestly correct; because in that place Amos is giving the contrast between what he *was* and what he *is* — 'I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; *but* I was an herdman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit; *and* the Lord took me from following the flock, *and* the Lord said unto me, Go, *prophesy* unto my people Israel.'

"But how does the editor of the *Review* know that she is a prophet, when she says she is not? Could not she herself have said that she *is* a prophet, just as easily as she did say that she is *not*? Could she not even have kept silence on the subject, if it were not true? What possible call was there for her to say, so repeatedly, and so publicly, 'I am not a prophet,' if it is not true?

"However, please bear in mind that I am not trying to prove that she is not a prophet. It is nothing to me one way or the other; and I have nothing to prove one

way or the other. I am only asking that I be allowed to believe what I heard her publicly and repeatedly say; and that I shall not be made a condemned heretic because I will not insist that she lied, or at least that she did not know what she was talking about.

"She said, 'I am not a prophet. I never made any such claim. I am a messenger with a message. And the message you will find in the books.' And she named 'Patriarchs and Prophets,' 'Great Controversy,' 'Christian Education,' as illustration."

Elder Jones states that he heard Sister White say the words: "I am not a prophet, I never made any such claim." Furthermore, he says "the statement was published in the *Review*." In order that the reader may have the exact statements for himself, and may thus know exactly what was said, and not take what somebody thinks was said or assumes was said, we herewith submit original documents that will make the matter clear.

What Sister White said in Battle Creek, Mich., was taken in shorthand. Here are her exact words as taken from the original verbatim shorthand notes of her talk in the Tabernacle, October 1, 1904: —

"I want to tell you the light has been given me, and many know what my work is. They say, She is a prophetess. I claim to be no such thing. I tell you what I want you all to know, that I am a messenger."

"I want to tell you that Mrs. White does not call herself a prophetess or a leader of this people. She calls herself simply a messenger. You have listened to Mrs. White, and you know what my testimony has been, and the same testimony has been borne to the people. I have not gone back on one sentence."

Elder Jones says he heard her say the words: "I am not a prophet, I never made any such claim." Those words can not be found in consecutive order at any place in her talk, and *four* of the *eleven* words which he quotes can not be found *at any place whatsoever* in all her talk

upon this matter. Then he did not hear those words spoken by Sister White in Battle Creek.

He claims that the words "I am not a prophet, I never made any such claim," were published in the *Review*. Here is what was published in the *Review and Herald* of January 26, 1905:—

"I said that I did not claim to be a prophetess. I have not stood before the people claiming this title, though many called me thus. I have been instructed to say, 'I am God's messenger, sent to bear a message of reproof to the erring and of encouragement to the meek and lowly.' With pen and with voice I am to bear the messages given me. The word given me is, 'You are faithfully to reprove those who would mar the faith of the people of God. Write out the things which I shall give you, that they may stand as a witness to the truth till the end of time.'"

So the words which Elder Jones claims were spoken in his hearing, and published in the *Review and Herald*, are not to be found. Thus it is again shown that his statement is not justified by the facts.

In corroboration and explanation of what Sister White did say in her discourse given at Battle Creek, Mich., October 1, 1904, the following, taken from a letter written to Elder O. A. Olsen, and dated January 30, 1905, will be pertinent, and helpful to the reader:—

"During the discourse I said that I did not claim to be a prophetess. Some were surprised at this statement, and as much is being said in regard to it, I will make an explanation. Others have called me a prophetess, but I have never assumed that title. I have not felt that it was my duty to thus designate myself. Those who boldly assume that they are prophets in this day are often a reproach to the cause of Christ.

"My work includes much more than this word signifies. I regard myself as a messenger, entrusted by the Lord with messages for his people. . . .

"To claim to be a prophetess is something that I have never done. If others call me by that name, I have no controversy with them. But my work has covered so many lines that I can not call myself other than a messenger, sent to bear a message from the Lord to his people, and to take up work in any line that he points out."

The statements here made remind one very forcibly of the Bible account regarding an experience of John the Baptist. To him there came at one time some Pharisees who asked, "Art thou that Prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. And they which were sent were of the Pharisees."

But regarding this same John and his work the Saviour says:—

"But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."

Elder Jones says that the editor of the *Review*, "against her own words that she is 'not a prophet,' undertook to prove that she is one; and either grossly misquoted, or else produced a strange translation" of Amos 7:14. This "strange" translation, this gross misquotation, is simply the marginal reading, taken from the American Standard Revised Version, of Amos 7:14.

Whether Mrs. White is a prophet or not may be determined from her writings, regardless of anything she may have said concerning names or titles. This is indeed a strange question for any one at all well acquainted with her writings to raise at this late day. It is utter folly for any one to argue that she is not a prophet. She is either a true or a false prophet; and the evidences are numerous and overwhelming that she is the former.

## DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE?

On page 63 we read this: "However, please bear in mind that I am not trying to prove that she is not a prophet. *It is nothing to me one way or the other*; and I have nothing to prove one way or the other." This is an alarming statement. Since the rise of this message this denomination has believed in the spirit of prophecy. We have preached it as widely as we have the Sabbath and other kindred truths, and believed it as thoroughly. It is an integral part of the beautiful system of truth which we call the third angel's message; so much is this so that those who have given up their faith in this part of the truth have invariably lost their spiritual perception, and eventually given up the whole message.

Sister White has been with this cause from its rise. Her counsel has molded the plans and policy of the work, and has led the denomination through many a crisis. We have believed that she was endowed with the prophetic gift. Elder Jones says he once "honestly and truly believed" this. Our hearts have been encouraged and cheered as she has told us of the things which the Lord has opened to her in visions and dreams of the night.

To us it makes a vast difference whether the one whom we have regarded from the rise of this message as being endowed with the prophetic gift is a prophet of God, or whether she is not. Elder Jones says, "It is nothing to me one way or the other." It is nothing to him, it seems, whether we have one among us who has visions from God, or who is a mere pretender. It is immaterial to him whether her books and writings, which he says he uses in his "own private study" and in "family worship," from which he says he receives "wonderful help," and upon the value of which, to him, he says no "sufficient estimate" can be made, are written by a prophet of God or by an imposter. If appealed to for light regarding this question, he has "nothing to prove one way or the other."

It would be just as consistent to say, "It is nothing to me one way or the other" whether the seventh day is the Sabbath or not; I have "nothing to prove" whether the Lord is coming or whether he is not; it is "nothing to me one way or the other" whether a man is mortal or immortal, or whether the wicked are to be annihilated or tortured throughout eternity.

We can not take the indifferent position Elder Jones professes to take here. "The Testimonies either bear the signet of God or that of Satan."—*Vol. V, page 98.*

To us it seems incomprehensible that an intelligent person should send statements broadcast which lead to such absurd conclusions. For fifty years the spirit of prophecy has been on trial. It has been opposed by foes, both within and without the denomination; but it has stood the test. Various individuals have given it up, and as a result have become hopelessly lost in the "mist and fog" of skepticism and unbelief. This should serve as a warning. Aside from the Bible, the writings which have emanated from this source are the most spiritual the world can produce, and we confidently expect that they will stand the test till the end.

Just which of the writings coming from this source Elder Jones believes to be Testimonies, and which not, he has not stated. He has simply cited certain ones, and said he did not believe these to be Testimonies. This is precisely the attitude taken by the "higher critics" toward the Bible. They single out certain parts of the Bible, and assert that these are not inspired. But no more subtle nor effective method can be employed than this to break down all faith in all inspired writing. Those who thus create doubt, weaken confidence, and destroy faith in God's message to his people and to the world, are sowing a harvest which they will little care to reap.

Elder Jones may say that to him his arguments do not destroy faith in the Testimonies; but this is by no means convincing proof as to their character. A tree is known

by its fruits. The effects of the sentiments and arguments to which Elder Jones has in this leaflet given expression, are the best evidence as to their real character and tendency. Because of these things, doubts and unbelief have been created in many minds, not only in regard to the Testimonies, but in regard to the whole message; and not a few have given up their faith in the message, and left the truth altogether.

Some who have been halting and doubting and looking for something to confirm them in their unbelief in the Testimonies will doubtless welcome this new assault upon them; while those who are believing, and loyal, and true will only be confirmed in their faith, and strengthened in their determination to press forward.

---

### A PLAIN CONTRADICTION

On page 43 Elder Jones says: "And when I have not changed in a single item of principle or of the truth, and yet I can not now preach these same things without being counted 'disloyal to the General Conference,' and 'disloyal to organized work,' then is it not perfectly plain that the change has been somewhere else than in me or in my teaching?"

Note that Elder Jones here positively states that he has "*not changed in a single item of principle or of the truth,*" but that whatever change there has been is "somewhere else than in me or in my teaching." Thus he plainly asserts that he both *believes* and *teaches* just as he has believed and taught in the past.

But compare this statement with the following taken from page 53 of the same leaflet:—

"The brethren and the people know well that whenever I was advocating a matter and some one produced a Testimony to the contrary, instead of explaining it away I



stopped instantly and changed my course accordingly. And that was because of my loyalty to the Testimonies. And that loyalty to the Testimonies was because I believed—honestly and truly believed—that everything that was written and sent out as Testimony was Testimony from the Lord. To that belief and that confidence I was as true as it is possible for a man to be. But that trust and that confidence have been betrayed. And by that betrayal I have been compelled—most reluctantly compelled, I assure you—yet literally compelled to *yield that position.*”

Here Elder Jones confesses that he had *changed his position* concerning the Testimonies. Once he “honestly and truly” believed “that everything that was written and sent out as Testimony was Testimony from the Lord.” Now he does not believe this, having been compelled, as he claims, “to yield that position.” How a man can change his faith, yield his position concerning a fundamental doctrine, and yet not have “changed in a single item,” he does not explain.

On page 67 he further says:—

“I will not pretend to stand for a thing as straight and true, and what people think that it is, that I personally know not to be so. I was as honest as a man can be in believing that everything that was issued in writing by Sister White was Testimony and from the Lord. And now I am not going to be dishonest in believing it, when by the evidence of immutable facts I have been compelled to recognize that it is not true.”

Here again he makes the direct statement that what he once believed concerning the Testimonies, he does *not* believe now. Once he honestly believed that “everything that was issued in writing by Sister White was Testimony.” Now he claims that he has been “compelled to recognize that *it is not true.*” We readily concede his right to change his belief concerning the Testimonies or anything else, if he chooses to do so. A man is respon-

sible to the Lord alone for what he believes. But when a man tells us that what he once believed he now no longer believes, and at the same time says he has "not changed in a single item," we can not understand his position. It is a plain contradiction. Both statements can not be true. His leaflet is itself clear evidence that he has changed his belief concerning the spirit of prophecy at least, and that what he once believed, he is now working to destroy.

---

### ELDER JONES'S "RETIREMENT"

On page 21 Elder Jones refers to the Conference held in Oakland, Cal., in 1903, and the changes made in the Constitution, one of which provided for a president of the General Conference. As a result of this action we are told that a "czardom was enthroned," a "bureaucratic government" built up, and a "centralized despotism" established, which has ever since been meddling with and manipulating affairs.

On page 37, referring to a further result of this so-called "monarchy," he says: "I knew then what would be at least some of the results of the action there taken, and spoke of it at the time; and when that action was finally taken by the Conference, I knew that it would stop my preaching under General Conference auspices the truth that I have been preaching all these years." He claims, therefore, that he has now gone to a place "where, in comparative retirement," he can "teach and preach" without interfering with the established order of things.

It certainly would be a calamity, if true, for some despotic rule to prevail, which would force able workers into "retirement."

We would like, however, to inquire what we now have as a result of the organization which was decided upon at the Oakland Conference, that we have not had from

the beginning of our denominational organization. It is true, we have a president of the General Conference now; but, with the exception of two years, we have had one since 1863. And if simply having a president establishes a "despotism," then we have had a "despotism" from the first. And it was under this so-called papal and despotic rule that Elder Jones was converted, and united with this people. Under it he labored for a score or more of years, becoming one of our prominent speakers and writers. Now, if he could labor under this so-called tyranny for so many years; attend General Conference, and vote; and accept, without a protest, a position on the highest committee of this "despotism," how does it happen he now finds it necessary to seek a place of "comparative retirement"?

But further, he says that "three months before the Conference met" in Oakland he had "decided to go to the Sanitarium to teach." Note this statement. Three months before this so-called "czardom was enthroned," he had decided to go to his present place of "comparative retirement." In other words, it was during the time when we *had no president*, when the plan of organization was in force which was adopted at the 1901 Conference, when Elder Jones claims the "monarchy was swept aside completely,"—it was at this time, when the church had no "visible head," that he decided to go into a place of "comparative retirement." How, then, can he charge his "retirement" to the "centralized despotism" which he claims is now dominating affairs, but which was not "enthroned" until the Oakland Conference?

All these strong charges made regarding some despotism being built up, are extravagant and untrue. They are put forth without any proof. We do not claim the organization we have is perfect in all its details; but it is the best the delegates at our General Conference knew how to construct; and those who constructed it are seeking to advance the message, and not to destroy it.

Those who read his leaflet under review, we think, will have no difficulty in understanding the true cause of Elder Jones's "comparative retirement."

---

## CONCLUSION

We have reached the time when the cup of the world's iniquity is almost full. Nations are making their last moves on the world's chess-board, preparatory to their final plunge into the lake of fire. The cloud of doom overshadows the world, and the seven last plagues are impending. On every hand distress and perplexity are increasing in the earth. Earthquakes and fires are sweeping populous cities with the besom of destruction, and the loftiest works of proud, ambitious men are being laid in ruins. Calamities, hitherto unknown for their severity, are speaking to the quaking hearts of humanity concerning the final consummation of all things. At such an hour as this, and with the last message men will ever hear, to carry to the world,—a message which gives the world men will ever hear,—a message which gives the only explanation of the tremendous events transpiring around us,—we felt that we had neither the time, the strength, nor the disposition to pause in the midst of our work to engage in this sort of controversy. Had we not felt that the exigencies of the case demanded it, we would have held our peace.

This attack against our work comes from one who in the past has exerted an influence in our midst, and now holds credentials from the denomination. To have allowed his misleading statements, glaring inaccuracies, and false charges to pass unchallenged might have been misunderstood by some. Besides this, his extravagant assumptions are put forth in such a way that those not familiar with the facts might be unsettled and confused were they not refuted. That the mask might be removed, the truth fully

vindicated, and confiding souls saved from being deceived, is our sole object in sending out this review.

Considerable attention has been given to a consideration of the indictment which Elder Jones has brought against our organized work. Without proof, he puts forth charges of the most damaging character. We urge that what is here presented concerning our denominational organization be carefully studied by all our people. Champions of disorganization have been with us more or less from the beginning, and have improved every opportunity to sow the baneful seeds of disunion and disintegration. It seems to be a choice weapon of apostasy to criticize and seek to pull down all properly constituted organization. Lucifer began his terrible work in the heavenly courts by assailing the organization and administrative affairs of the government of heaven. He charged that a tyranny had been enthroned. The rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram was of a similar character. But proper steps to maintain system and order are at all times pleasing to the Lord. Special efforts have been made during the last few years to develop and perfect our organization, and the Lord has greatly blessed in this. As the message increases, and reaches out to every part of the world, we shall doubtless find it necessary to still further adjust and strengthen our plan of organization.

The evidence herewith presented against the charges preferred is invulnerable. We have not produced hearsay evidence, nor trusted to the "best of our memory." But in refutation of the things set forth in the leaflet under review to show the unreliability of the Testimonies, we have gone to the files of the author, and secured the original copies of the Testimonies which are questioned. These Testimonies stand before us as mute, yet unimpeachable witnesses against the assumptions made, showing that they do not contain the contradictory statements and inaccuracies with which are claimed to be found in them. It is upon the sure foundation of the Testimonies

themselves that we have built our argument concerning their integrity.

And, while deeply regretting the need of refuting the charges sent forth by Elder Jones, in comparing and analyzing the Testimonies questioned, our faith and confidence in the divine source of these messages have been greatly strengthened, and we feel sure that the perusal of the evidence of their reliability here presented will also greatly strengthen the faith of our people in the spirit of prophecy.

Concerning those who sow the seeds of doubt regarding the Testimonies we have been instructed as follows: "If you seek to turn aside the counsel of God to suit yourselves; if you lessen the confidence of God's people in the Testimonies he has sent them, you are rebelling against God as certainly as were Korah, Dathan, and Abiram."

We are truly living in the shaking time. "In this time the gold will be separated from the dross in the church. True godliness will be clearly distinguished from the appearance and tinsel of it. Many a star that we have admired for its brilliancy will then go out in darkness. Chaff like a cloud will be borne away on the wind from places where we see only floors of rich wheat." As champions forsake the ranks, and standard bearers permit the colors to trail in the dust; when defenders of the faith are few, then strong, courageous hearts must come to the front. "At this time we must gather warmth from the coldness of others, courage from their cowardice, and loyalty from their treason."

A ship floating on the broad bosom of the ocean far from the harbor may deviate from her course without special danger. She may even "run before the storm" for a time with comparative safety. But it is vastly different when nearing port. Then the slightest divergence from her course is disastrous. She must face the storm and breakers at all hazards, or be wrecked on the rocks.

So with us; we are nearing the end. The weary pilgrim so long rocked on the restless wave can discern in the distance the haven of rest. Our vessel is nearing the port, and it is a time of special peril to every soul. A very little deviation now from the course prescribed may mean destruction to the soul who thus wavers..

In conclusion, may we not express the hope that Elder Jones, for whom we entertain only the most friendly feelings, may himself see the error into which he has fallen, and again place his feet upon the solid rock of truth, and take his stand with the people of God to battle for the right, and triumph with them in the soon-coming kingdom.

And now, brethren, we "commend you to God and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

#### GENERAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE.

NOTE.—In closing the letter to me which Elder Jones has published in the leaflet we have reviewed, he states that he has no desire or purpose to make the letter public; and that if it, or any parts of it, should get out, I would be the one who would let it out. He further states that my course may cause him to publish it as an "Open Letter" to me and to "all the people." After reading the letter I decided not to make it public in any way, and held to my purpose until after Elder Jones himself made it public. Sunday night, March 4, 1906, he read the most of the letter to a large congregation in the Battle Creek Sanitarium chapel. A report of that meeting was printed in one of the Battle Creek daily papers, and that report gave the leading points of his letter. So it was Elder Jones, and not myself, who first made the letter public, both to our people and to the world.

A. G. D.

*"Generality is the cloak of fiction,  
While minuteness is the mantle of truth."*